National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 31. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1855. WHOLE NO. 811.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

THE STANDARD.

EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY

OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Reported for THE STANDARD by W. H. BURR.

THE Eighteenth Annual Convention of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society was held at Sansom street Hall, Philadelphia, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of last week. The meeting was called to order at half-past 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning, by the President, JAMES MOTT.

Mr. Edward M. Davis was, on motion of James Miller McKim, appointed temporary Secretary.

The Vice-Presidents, Benjamin C. Bacon and Robert Purvis, took their seats upon the platform with J. Miller McKim, Corresponding Secretary.

A prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Grew.

The following persons, on motion of Mr. Grew, were appointed to form a Business Committee: J. Miller McKim, Edward M. Davis, Mary Grew, Dr. B. Fussell, Reuben Tomlinson, Lucretia Mott, Oliver Johnson and Thomas Whitson.

The name of Wm. Lloyd Garrison was, on motion, added to the list.

A resolution was adopted fixing the hours of meeting at 10 A.M, 3 P.M. and 7 P.M.

The following resolution was offered by Mr. McKim, and adopted:

Resolved, That all persons who may be present at these meetings, whether friendly or unfriendly to their object, be invited to participate in the discussions.

At this moment Andrew T. Foss and Charles C. Burleigh entered the Hall, whereupon

Mr. DAVIS took occasion to allude to a challenge recently made by his namesake, General Davis, of Bucks County, to all the world to meet him in the discussion of the question of slavery, which challenge was accepted by Messrs. Burleigh and Foss, and the discussion had at Hatborough, Montgomery County, Pa. He hoped the gentlemen would favour the Society with some account of that meeting.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, in response to the request, stated that it was announced in seven public places, a short time before the meeting alluded to was held, that Mr. Foss was to whip Gen. Davis. Accordingly, last evening, Mr. Foss, after commencing the flagellation, put the whip in his (Mr. Burleigh's) hands, and he was bound to put it on. The discussion was continued from 7 to 11 o'clock, in a closely packed assembly, who listened with fixed attention throughout; and he thought if Gen. Davis were to make a report to-day, he would agree, at least, that as the decision of the judges was in favour of the anti-slavery side of the question, so was the manifest feeling of the audience. One circumstance, of no slight interest, connected with the decision, was the fact that one of the judges was a political partisan of the same party with their opponent, and the other was a son-in-law of the same; so that it might be fairly presumed that the decision was not given in favour of the anti-slavery side from any favour towards it or them.

Having thus given you a summary of the history of last evening's performance, it may, perhaps, be proper that I should pass to a few remarks of a more general character. Our coming together at each successive anniversary presents the occasion for a sort of cursory review of the events of the past and of the position of the cause at the present time. This will undoubtedly be given more fully in detail by the reading of your report; but we may glance at some prominent points even in anticipation of that—at least may bring to view the general truth that whatever may have been done during the past year apparently favourable to the cause of the oppressor, or seeming to promise him triumph, we have, on the whole, no reason to doubt or to despair. Every attempt of the Slave Power from the beginning hitherto to gain fresh advantage in this controversy has served to stimulate the anti-slavery feeling of the North, to waken a sympathy in the minds of persons who otherwise might have slumbered much longer, and so to give us facilities for the promotion of our cause with more energy and success. We have no reason to doubt our ultimate triumph even if to-day the sky should look somewhat dark and the storm should seem to be menacing. What may be the immediate issue of some of the controversies now going on, such as the question of freedom or slavery in Kansas, the question of turning the free States into slave States, or the question of making your highways channels of the internal slave trade, the future must answer; but let these questions be answered as they may, one thing we may confidently answer as certain: either that the response will come in the shape of a defeated Slave Power in those particular instances, promising a succession of defeats, or it will come in the shape of some fresh insult and aggression upon the North that will deepen the feeling of hostility to slavery, make more intense the spirit of opposition, and hasten the creation of that public opinion which will adopt the motto we have been so long holding up before the nation's gaze—No Union with Slaveholders. Certainly it has been demonstrated already with a tolerable degree of clearness that there is no practical Union, no oneness of interest, feeling or principle throughout the different parts of the land. Look into your Congress Halls to-day—how much union is there? See the successive fruitless efforts to organize the House. See the plans and schemes of retaliation, as they are called, which are beginning to manifest themselves at the South—acts proposed in Virginia, Georgia and elsewhere to avenge upon the free States the supposed misdeeds of the fanatics and disturbers of the peace in those States, whereby the security of the tenure of slave-property is so seriously endangered. For my part, I confess I should not look with quite so much regret upon the success of some of those schemes as upon some other movements of the Slave Power. If Georgia, for example, chooses to lay under contribution all the property belonging to the citizens of the free States happening to be within her own borders in order to compensate for the loss of her self-emancipated slaves, let her do it; let her levy upon the property of Northern pro-slavery merchants and manufacturers—for I apprehend they are the principal class of property-holders in the State of Georgia. Let us see what effect it will have upon them—how pleasantly they will bear the burden of the salvation of the Union. If the slaveholders choose to take that mode of allaying the agitation, for my part I say God speed the experiment. I am inclined to think they will have occasion to adopt the line of the poet,

"That lulls it as the north wind lulls the sea."

Whatever way these new schemes of the Slave Power turn, we may calculate upon making profit to the anti-slavery cause. It will only furnish a new illustration of the long familiar proverb, that "whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad."

But our confidence in the ultimate triumph of our cause is not based upon any such measures as these, nor upon any reaction which may result from the too strong pressure of the slaveholding tyranny upon our rights and interests; it is in the power of truth and the eternal principle of justice. We have the almighty arm of the God of Justice to bear us up. Let the politician be for a moment excited to spasmodic resistance, or recoil into apathy more dead from the momentary extraordinary excitement; let the business man for a moment be stung to frenzy and to a disposition to retaliation, or cow down from dread of the loss of his accustomed cent per cent.; still we have the right and the truth on our side; deep down in the heart of the mass of the people there exists an appreciation of right which God has so inwrought into the constitution of man that no power has ever yet been adequate to its eradication. To that innate sense we appeal, which will testify in our favour all the more earnestly, effectively and perseveringly that we make our appeals to it. It is but the prejudice of the hour, the fancied interest of the present—a transient prejudice, an imagined interest—that stands in the way of our progress. To-day the politician will delude the people with the belief that the success of this or that party is essential to the prosperity of the nation; to-morrow the failure of his promise to be fulfilled works conviction in the minds of the people of the folly of trusting in politicians. To-day we are warned of the danger to the perpetuity of the Union in agitating the delicate question of slavery; to-morrow comes and the nation is neither sunk nor destroyed, its business goes on, its industry thrives as before; meanwhile the people begin to suspect that the solemn warning was the language of self-interest, which was willing to sacrifice humanity and the public good for its own ends. Every controversy upon this question or on any questions collateral thereto will terminate in the enlargement of the anti-slavery feeling, in the multiplication of the number of converts and in the clearer perception by the mass of the people of the truth of anti-slavery principles. Every force which works against our cause is in a greater or less degree spasmodic—certainly transient and temporary. The force which launches the shot from the gun may seem for a time to overcome the power of gravitation; but gravitation works constantly, and if not at any one moment as strong as the contending force, yet, by its constant action, is sure to overcome it at last. When the volcano pours out its molten stream down the mountain side and hurls its heated rocks into mid heaven, we have no fears that the centre of the earth is about to be poured out into the atmosphere; for the constant, unceasing tendency of all things to harmony will at length bring back the erring masses to their proper position and make sure the triumph of the everlasting law. Ours is the everlasting law, always acting and tending to bring things into harmony. As well might we fear that the swelling tide will inundate and overwhelm the continent as that wrong and oppression will swallow up and overwhelm the right, because to-day it seems to threaten such a result. At the very moment when the whitening crest of the wave seems to display a consciousness of triumph, the constantly acting law is beginning to break down the transient impulse and compel the wave to subside to the ocean level.

We fear not, then, for the issue of this controversy. Men ask us to compromise. For the sake of what? Momentary success. They ask us to rush to the ballot-box and elect this man and defeat the other. We rejoice whenever the influence of anti-slavery sentiment has spread so far as to secure the election of men who are opposed to slavery. It is a cheering sign of the times when the candidate for the Speakership in the House of Representatives, supported as an anti-slavery man, can come so near to an election, while his opponent, who is regarded as the very embodiment of the slave interest in that body, stands fixed at a point below the necessary level which can afford any hope of success. It would certainly be a triumph if the representative of anti-slavery principles should be elected, in defiance of Southern opposition, to the Speaker's chair. Let men who have not seen how high and stern are our principles elect men of their own faith to offices of State; but let us rather stand faithfully at our post by the central fire, feeding the furnace continually with that fuel which shall generate the caloric without which all your machinery would stop and your political success be alike unprofitable (applause).

Mr. J. MILLER MCKIM then submitted, on behalf of the Executive Committee, the Eighteenth Annual Report, of which the following is an abstract:

The Report opened by stating that the Society had been nineteen years in existence; that in that time it had expended $150,000; had circulated millions of anti-slavery newspapers, tracts and other publications, and had held not fewer than 2,500 public meetings. The object of the Society was the "abolition of slavery." Had it done anything toward effecting that object? This question, it was the business of the Report to answer.

It was conceded that slavery had not been abolished in any State or Territory; that, with the exception of the District of Columbia, the State Slave Trade had not been arrested; that the pro-slavery feeling at the South was apparently more extensive and more virulent now than ever before; that in all the great national issues that had been raised on the slave question, the South had carried their point. This was acknowledged with great candour, as a concession due to the South. But, nevertheless, there was another side to the picture, and this was presented. Victories are sometimes fruitful in disaster to the conquerors. There are some triumphs that are worse than defeats. This was the view the Report took of the triumphs of the Slave Power in the Mexican war controversy; in that upon the Fugitive Slave law, and also upon that of the Nebraska bill. The Mexican war was a slaveholding war, but it had given to the North the State of California, a State whose annual gold crop of $100,000,000 was among its least advantages, and a State occupying a position and having resources fitted to make her one of the most influential powers in the country, and in the future history of the world. The Fugitive Slave law was declared to be a failure. More fugitives had passed through a single underground gateway in the Southern Pennsylvania border than had been delivered up from this State in the five years that had elapsed since the passage of the law, and more had passed through the same avenue in a single week than had been sent back in those five years from all the free States put together. The disposition to help fugitives was universal in the North. Virginia had probably lost more slave-property, by tenfold, since her Senator introduced his bill for the recovery of fugitives, than she ever lost in the same space of time before.

The Nebraska bill was a triumph to the slaveholders, but they achieved too much when they destroyed the Northern faith in Southern compromises. Compromise was the ruin of this country. The Nebraska bill had dispelled the illusion of the sacredness of the compromises between slavery and liberty. In doing this, it had done a work for abolition.

Public opinion in the free States had undergone a great change. This was seen in the politics of the country. There is an anti-slavery majority now in the popular branch of Congress; and the more distinguished members of the Senate are anti-slavery. In literature, anti-slavery productions now contribute a large portion of the popular reading. The house of Jewett & Co., of Boston, alone, had published and sold 803,000 volumes of anti-slavery books, worth in the market $413,000. The Northern theatres had become anti-slavery propaganda. In the Church the change had not been so striking, but was encouraging.

Public sentiment had undergone a change, and so far the Anti-Slavery Societies had accomplished their object. This change was as yet but partial; the evidence of its completion would be seen in the withdrawal of all support, moral and political, given by the North to the slave system. To this end all anti-slavery people of every creed were labouring. It was admitted that such a withdrawal of Northern support to slavery would be a dissolution of the Union. The issue was spoken of as inevitable. It was admitted that the anti-slavery enterprise, whether its friends knew it or not, was revolutionary. The question of slavery involved that of the Union—touch the one and you touch the other. Withdraw Northern support from one and you dissolve the other. Dissolution was written in the nature of the Federal compact; its contagiousness could only end in separation. Such an event the Report regarded as highly beneficent. Its consequences would be a benefit to the country and the world.

Notice was taken of Governor Pollock and of the Pennsylvania delegation to Congress. John Hickman, the member from Chester County, was condemned for voting for the Nebraska leader for Speaker. A large space was devoted to the Kane and Williamson case; and Judge Kane was condemned severely, as were also Judge Black and his associates of the State Supreme Bench, and Judge Knox was eulogized.

The Society was stated to be in a flourishing condition and the cause was declared to be onward. A Divine origin was claimed for the anti-slavery movement. God, who rules in the hearts of the people and reigns among the nations of the earth, was claimed to be its author. This was the ground of the Abolitionists' hope and faith. They laboured on in confidence, believing that He that began the great work would carry it on to the end.

HENRY GREW begged leave to make a few remarks in regard to the very excellent Report just submitted. He entirely concurred with the language of the Report in reference to the position of the Church. But there were some exceptions; some churches had taken strong anti-slavery ground, and were opposed to slavery root and branch.

In regard to the Dissolution of the Union, if the principles avowed by this Society should prevail, so far from tending to a dissolution of any Union that was worth possessing, they would rather promote a true and happy Union. He would admit, however, that if the alternative should be presented, the Union should be sacrificed to principle. He wanted it to be known that the principles upon which this Society was based were the only principles upon which to base a true and proper Union.

Mr. GARRISON said he had listened to the Report with much satisfaction. Perhaps it would have been well to have named the exceptions to which friend Grew had alluded, although those exceptions were never anxious to be mentioned. The Anti-Slavery Society had always been ready to give credit where it was due. In reference to the Union, the duty of Abolitionists was clear; a Union cemented with the blood of millions now in bondage and maintained only because they were in bondage was to be pronounced accursed, and to be overthrown. Its overthrow was not a thing to fear; it was inevitable, and the voice of God was calling upon them all to come out and be separate. Anything short of that was treason to the cause of humanity.

LUCRETIA MOTT regretted that in the number of those removed by death during the past year, the name of Esther Moore was omitted; it was occasioned probably by the circumstance of her departure immediately after last Anniversary, now more than a year ago.

OLIVER JOHNSON took exception to that part of the Report which claimed California as a free State. It was put a little too strong, in his opinion, inasmuch as slavery actually did exist there by statute, though contrary to her Constitution.

On motion, the Convention adjourned till afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. MCKIM explained the reason of the omission of the name of Esther Moore. Her death took place more than twelve months ago, and hence escaped the observation of the Committee. She was a venerable and devoted friend of the cause, and a tribute to her memory should have been embodied in the Report.

In regard to omitting to name exceptions to the pro-slavery character of the churches and clergy, if time and space had permitted he would gladly have supplied them but his instructions were to make the Report as short as possible, and it was supposed that the exceptions would take care of themselves.

Mr. GREW still thought that the omission was a very important one in view of the great influence of the Church; and regretted that it had been made. He mentioned the *American Baptist* as an exception to the pro-slavery character of the religious press.

ANDREW T. FOSS appreciated very much friend Grew's idea, but it was difficult to define the exceptions. He had often tried to give credit when he afterward found the facts to contradict him. He did not agree with friend Grew in regard to the *American Baptist*, which, though of an anti-slavery character compared with other religious papers, was not as thorough as it should be. What was its stand in regard to other Baptist churches than those with whom it is more closely identified? If a revival took place in Dr. Sharp's or Dr. Stow's church, or in any other pro-slavery church, that paper always recorded it as a "triumph of the Redeemer's kingdom." Conversions to nothing else than creedism, sectarianism and intense hatred of colour and race were regarded as accessions to the Church of Christ. Such compromises rendered it unfit for their approval. The same might be said of the *Morning Star* and the Freewill Baptists; their relation to pro-slavery churches rendered it impossible for Abolitionists to support them. He would be glad to note any real progress on the part of the Church, but it was difficult to point it out.

Mr. GREW dissented entirely from the view expressed with regard to revivals of religion—that people were converted to "nothing but pro-slavery." And he did not ask for any particular commendation of any particular paper.

Mr. FOSS—I believe I said creedism, sectarianism and pro-slavery.

Mr. GREW believed many were converted to God, though they were necessarily brought under pro-slavery influences.

Mr. MCKIM submitted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That, in the present aspect of the slavery question and of the anti-slavery enterprise, we "bate no jot of heart or hope," but pledge ourselves anew, with full confidence in the truth and the God of truth, to the great work of the slave's deliverance, believing that all the seeming triumphs of evil will but make more signal its ultimate and inevitable defeat.

Resolved, That we renew our protest against slavery, as not only an evil, but a sin—not only a curse, but a crime—not to be deprecated for the abuses to which it is liable, but to be denounced as itself the greatest of all abuses; not to be mitigated, but to be utterly abolished.

Mr. GARRISON—Mr. President, I am extremely happy to be with you again at your annual meeting. No part of the country do I visit with more pleasure than this; no truer, more enlightened or more uncompromising friends of the slave are to be found within my knowledge, and the last to desert the cause of the oppressed will be yourselves. I say this in no spirit of compliment or flattery, but from long experience, and with very grateful remembrance of your hearty and long continued coöperation from the earliest period in the cause of the oppressed.

We are met to discuss the question of slavery. Who ever heard of a meeting in the South to discuss the subject, for the purpose of convincing the people of the South that slavery ought to be maintained at all hazards? Such a meeting was never dreamed of in South Carolina or Georgia. And yet a great many pro-slavery meetings are held at the South as well as anti-slavery meetings at the North; but at the South they come together not for discussion and argument, but with their minds made up and ready for action. This it is which always distinguishes the South; they have made up their minds and are determined to act as one man.

Not so at the North. We are met here to-day not so much for action as discussion. We find it necessary to throw light upon the Northern mind and persuade the people that liberty ought to be paramount to everything else while it is in so great jeopardy—that they ought to lay aside their peculiar political and religious views and unite as one man on the side of freedom. We are not prepared for action at the North because we have no union among ourselves; it is a perfect Babel—a confusion of tongues among us. We have our Fusion party, our Liberty party, and our Disunion party. Instead of our accomplishing anything to put down slavery, it is the consolidated power of slavery that is putting down liberty among us.

The Report which was read to us this morning gave us good ground for encouragement in regard to success. It is not easy to measure our success in the last twenty years. When we began, weak in numbers and in personal influence, and endeavoured to hold a little meeting in this hamlet and that village, wherever we made the attempt we were sure to be assailed. Our meetings were regularly mobbed, and it was as impossible to obtain a fair hearing at the North as it is to-day in South Carolina. That mobocratic spirit has almost entirely disappeared, and there is now a very general disposition and even desire to hear what may be said not only of slavery in the abstract, but of our responsibilities in the premises. When we began, any other question was deemed of incomparably more importance than ours; now, is there any other question before this nation but ours? Like Aaron's rod, it has swallowed up all the rods of the religious and political magicians, and there is no distinctive issue before the nation but slavery. It is the theme of discussion in the highways and public places; the whole nation is a vast debating society in perpetual session.

There are no parties such as formerly existed. The Whig party is but a remnant; the Democratic party has been broken and is destined to be ground to powder. Slavery is at its wit's end to know where to incarnate and reörganize itself against the growing forces of Liberty. It made the attempt through the Know-Nothing movement, but without success. Possibly it may succeed in the coming Presidential election in reörganizing upon a national pro-slavery basis, but in that case it will be certain of losing a very large number who are now attached to the party. I think we never had so significant a sign of the times as the separation which took place in that party in this city last June. No party seeking to grasp all the powers and emoluments of the nation ever before allowed itself to be defeated on any other issue.

It is a great change and indicative of progress to have substituted Charles Sumner for Daniel Webster, Henry Wilson for Edward Everett, and John P. Hale for Charles G. Atherton, of gag notoriety. It is gratifying to see Chase Governor of Ohio, representing the highest sphere of political anti-slavery—not occupying our ground, but approximating towards it.

The change in the Press of the North is also very marked; for whereas formerly we had none to speak a good word for us, there are now hundreds more or less imbued with the spirit of anti-slavery. The *New York Tribune*, with its extraordinary ability and unparalleled circulation, is a powerful auxiliary to our cause.

In regard to religious progress, the Report states that the Church and Clergy follow, but do not lead. That is something; it is a great deal to see them following on the right side and keeping within hailing distance. I think the temperance, peace and other reforms have all demonstrated that we cannot rationally look to the Church and clergy to lead in the cause of humanity. The popular religion of our land has taken a gigantic wrong and baptized it in the name of God, so that the moment you touch that which the religion of the land sanctions you touch the religion itself, and wo be to him who dares to do that act; his reputation will perish. The religion of our land is, in this respect, not essentially different from the Jewish, Pagan or Mohammedan religion. You and I as a dissenter from Paganism in Burmah, or Mohammedanism in Turkey, would be infidels. So in America, dissenting from the popular religion, we must take our lot among heretics and infidels—not that he who protests against wrong is an irreligious man or infidel in the sense in which the term is applied; on the contrary, his actions are evidence of his love of justice and reliance on God. The prophets were not bad men, but they were so considered by the popular religion of their times. Jesus was denounced by the popular religion of his time as a blasphemer, as having a devil, and as worse than Barrabbas, who was a thief and a murderer. We do not believe what was said against Luther and Melancthon and George Fox and William Penn; and yet they all protested against the religion of their times and were anathematized for it. So in due time will the anti-slavery reform stand justified. The religious sentiment is now changing [illegible] outside pressure. It is being compelled to change front to accommodate itself to the anti-slavery sentiment. It was a great thing when the Methodist heirarchy was riven asunder upon this question—not that the Northern wing was disposed to take any ground against slaveholding as a sin, but because it took occasion to intimate that slaveholding was not the best thing for a Methodist bishop. Bishop Andrew was a slaveholder, and it was meekly and modestly submitted whether, on the whole, he had n't better put away his slaves, in order to remove an impediment in the way of Methodism in some parts of the country. For that cause the Methodist Church was riven asunder, and as the first fruits of that division came the Wesleyan Methodists, laying down the glorious principle that slaveholding is a sin against God of such a nature as to forfeit Christian character. And whatever portion of that body have coöperated with us will not object when I say that the anti-slavery movement has been the great instrument in the hands of God of bringing forth this glorious result. Had it not been for our movement, the Freewill Baptists, in all probability, would have gone on as other denominations, making slaveholding no test of Christian character or fellowship. A Freewill Baptist is no longer allowed to be a slaveholder any more than a Quaker. These things are cheering as far as they go. The position, to be sure, is not the highest, but to some extent they carry out anti-slavery principles.

A very great change has been wrought in the feelings of the people in regard to the coloured population. When we began, the hatred toward coloured people was everywhere prevalent and most intense. The coloured man had no privileges or favours shown him; now he is found among the lawyers, doctors, clergymen, orators and scholars. In a large portion of the North he can travel without insult. Schools are open to him on terms of equality.

But let us look at what remains to be done. The danger is, that we shall think, in view of the past, that we may have a respite and need not be as vigilant and generous towards the cause as we once were. But let it be remembered that as yet there has been no real issue made on this subject as between the North and South. The North stands in precisely the same religious relation to the South as she did fifty years ago; and, until a religious issue is made by the North, as such, we may not hope to see slavery crippled or the system overthrown. All the respectable denominations of the North are still intensely pro-slavery, still recognise the manstealer as one in whom dwells the spirit of Christ, still open their doors and admit him to their communion. Politically, too, we are where we have always been, bound up in the same compact and with the same disposition as ever to carry out all that was compromised at the formation of the Constitution.

There is another humiliating fact. The Report speaks with proper exultation of the fact that, in the course of one day, more slaves now make their escape than have been recovered under the Fugitive Slave law of 1850 since its passage. True; but remember that when they escape, instead of coming to us standing erect and looking heavenward in the broad light of day, they come in the darkness of the night, trembling and not knowing whether they can meet us as friends or as enemies. All we can do for them is merely to get them out of Pennsylvania, out of the country, over into Canada, under a foreign flag, in order that their manhood may be recognised and their liberty maintained. The people of Pennsylvania, like those of my own State, are a banditti as against the fugitives of the land; they do not allow them to be here in safety. Our first work, then, is to emancipate the North. Why should we talk of Alabama or Louisiana, or of what slaveholders do? Sometimes I am inclined to think it would be the wisest policy and most efficient course to forget that there is a South while our great North is guilty of all that is involved in a complicity with that system; for if we cannot make Pennsylvania anti-slavery ground, it is idle to expect the South ever to emancipate her slaves. If here the fugitive must run and hide himself, what does it imply? That, like the slaveholders, you have no idea of equal justice, but are in league with those who make merchandise of the image of God. The first thing, therefore, on your part, is a most thorough repentance before a word can be uttered against the slaveholders of the South.

A few weeks ago, I was in the city of Springfield, Mass., attending an Anti-Slavery Convention. Our meeting was held on Sunday, a very good day on which to extricate those who have fallen into the pit of slavery. In the afternoon, a gentleman came forward and said that he had heard a discourse in the forenoon undertaking to prove that slavery was sanctioned by God in the Old and New Testament, and that the preacher spoke of having been complained of for having, a few Sundays before, allowed a slaveholder to preach in his pulpit, and said that he would do it again if he had the opportunity, and that, if he should remove South, he would assuredly become a slaveholder. I said to the people of Springfield who were present, your anti-slavery duty is very clear; the first thing and the only thing to be done by you is to make Springfield too hot for that wolf in sheep's clothing to dwell in; and until he is driven out, your city is stained with the blood of slaves. I mean driven out not by violence and brutality, in imitation of the slaveholders, but by the force of moral opinion.

I was in Concord, New Hampshire, not long since, and had occasion to say to the people of that State that their work was not at the South, but at home; that it was gratuitous to go abroad when they had at the head of Dartmouth College a Rev. Dr. Lord, who had put forth a pamphlet in vindication of slavery, on the ground that it was sustained by natural and revealed religion—nay, who had even laid down the doctrine that tyranny throughout the world, in all its phases, was of God, and without God would not have been able to rule the world. That man moulds the minds of theological students who are sent forth to be what are called ambassadors of Christ.

Now, in regard to the people of Pennsylvania, the first work to be done is on your own soil. You have begun very well in regard to the case of Judge Kane. His case is analagous to Dr. Lord's and that of the minister at Springfield. You must see to it that all your moral artillery is brought to bear against Judge Kane. In striking down such a man, you strike off a vast many chains from the limbs of the slaves of the South.

We have our specific work to do in Boston. The Rev. Nehemiah Adams spent three months feasting and being petted by the slaveholders at the South, and he came back and published a work undertaking to show that there is nothing beneath the sun so excellent as slaveholding and slave-breeding; that slavery is a cure for pauperism, mobocracy and violence of every kind; that it is the very hotbed of the religious sentiment, and that no part of the people of our country are, on the whole, so near the Kingdom of God as slaves, except it be their masters. We must so change the public sentiment that Dr. Adams shall not be permitted to preach in Boston. In selecting such cases and bringing our efforts to bear upon them, we shall engage directly with the great enemy himself. He incarnates himself in some strong man or great institution or powerful party, and true philosophy indicates that we should strike where the enemy is nearest, and our blows will be more effective.

Let me say, again, that I know of no part of the North where an anti-slavery meeting receives a hearty welcome on the part of the inhabitants. I may be in error, but I doubt whether there is a single village where a meeting like this is not stigmatized by all that is respectable, fashionable and religious in the place, as an infidel, disorganizing, treasonable gathering—where, if a vote could be taken whether it should be held, it would not be recorded against the meeting [illegible] still the prevailing sentiment is on the side of the oppressor, and a great work remains to be done. I have spoken of the better feeling that prevails now in regard to coloured persons; but still that spirit of prejudice is frightfully prevalent. It is impossible for any one to put himself in the place of the black man in this Union. What is it to be looked upon with disgust and hatred, as though we were lepers? What is it to be everywhere made to feel that we are not a part of the human family like others? We have a great work to do in combatting this cruel, unnatural prejudice toward those whom God has coloured a little differently from ourselves; for we may always exonerate the beneficent Creator from the charge that the complexion of a man causes him to be hated—that black will ever be odious to white or white to black. There is never any prejudice on the part of blacks against whites, because they are the oppressed party and have nothing to induce them to hate the white man, except his cruelty; and where slavery does not exist, there is no prejudice against colour. It is not complexion that causes the hatred, but it is the degradation and cruelty which they suffer.

It is now something over a year since your Society came together. I am always reminded of the Slave Power as an incentive to effort. A hundred thousand more victims have been added to slavery since you last met; a hundred thousand born into this breathing world at the South to be plundered, outraged and treated like brutes—to grow up in intellectual darkness and moral degradation—to be divested of all conscience, reverence for God and ability to do the will of God—never on earth to know anything of home, or fireside, or parental privileges, or filial relations—never to be allowed to testify against any white ruffian who may have outraged them—to be the subject of mortgage, deed, bequest, inheritance, traffic as perishable property. Oh, anti-slavery men and women, what motives for exertion are presented to us by this picture! Talk of zeal and heat! I blush whenever I hear the charge. It is the only charge that makes me feel that we have come short of our duty. How much of our feeling is merely spasmodic and incidental! A few months ago, the whole city of Boston and Commonwealth of Massachusetts was on fire. The people could not sleep, and we were on the brink of civil war. What was the matter? A single runaway slave was about to be carried off from Boston back into bondage. Only one, an obscure man, in himself presenting nothing especially interesting; unknown, except that he was a poor vagabond slave. Well, one slave *ought* to throw the whole State into commotion, and the people ought not to sleep where one man is made a mere beast of by others. It was a glorious feeling, but, alas, it was spasmodic, not based upon principle. A hundred thousand Anthony Burnses have been stolen and sent into slavery since last your Society met. Does Pennsylvania quake, is Massachusetts agitated in view of this overwhelming fact? No.

Look at Kansas. Our free State men went to Kansas to find houses, firesides and freedom for themselves. But where do they stand at the present time? Cowering under the bowie-knife of the slaveholding ruffians. Where are the free State men of Kansas who are to show us what the spirit of '76 means? They have succumbed to slavery by allowing it to exist on the soil of Kansas until July, 1857; free coloured people are prohibited from entering the State; and Gov. Reeder has been chosen to represent them in Congress, a man in whose veins there runs not a drop of anti-slavery blood. The slaveholders compromise not; they do not yield. Think of what Stringfellow and Atchison have been able to accomplish by having a backbone in favour of slavery. The free State men talk of resistance, but it is all talk; there is compromise and cowering all the way through.

Look again at Congress. How many times the House of Representatives has balloted for Speaker. How goes the Democratic vote? Always for slavery. They know they cannot succeed by keeping aloof from the Know-Nothing and Anti-Slavery parties, and yet they never yield. I confess, my admiration of such fidelity and firmness is very great. I would that we ourselves throughout the North could present a similar front.

Anti-slavery zeal is excessive, is it? Why, I am addressing a subjected people. Since I was last with you, you have lost your liberties as a State. The decision of Judge Kane overrides your Constitution. In vain, as a people, have you undertaken to define the rights of man; you have no rights. If Passmore Williamson is out of jail once more, it is not because Judge Kane has changed his edict or altered his construction of law, or has been, in reality, defeated of his purpose. His decision stands like Gibraltar; it is the decision of this nation through him. Your own State has been vanquished; your own Judges have refused to take a stand against him, acknowledging that his decision must be submitted to. That decision is in effect this: that slaveholders have a right to bring their slaves into Pennsylvania as property and hold them here as such.

Anti-slavery zeal and fanaticism! What is the whole amount of contributions to the Anti-Slavery Societies? A few thousand dollars. How much is done to fill up the treasury of this Society (I am not speaking reproachfully)? I suppose if you realize two thousand or twenty-five hundred dollars at your Bazaar, you will be doing well. Only think what a paltry State effort. In Boston, with the generous support of the good people on the other side of the Atlantic, all that we have been able to show is about $5,000—a very paltry sum for such a cause. Does that show an extraordinary degree of fanaticism or zeal? Quite the contrary.

We must not be content with the past, and in our future efforts let us beware how we waste our time in barren generalities. It was once of importance to discuss the duty of immediate emancipation. It is idle now. For seven years we talked about a principle in the abstract, because we had first to settle that before we could apply it. We are not to go over that ground again. Indeed, nobody has ever needed any light on this subject of slavery. God never made a man who did not believe, in his inmost soul, that slaveholding is the greatest crime that can be perpetrated against human nature. I mean no man ever needed light in regard to his own case, and that is the way to settle it; the exact value which a man places upon liberty for himself is the exact value which God shall mete out to him in regard to his conduct towards others. It is by the constant affirmation of our principle as right and the faithful application of it to men and institutions that we shall succeed, and only in that manner shall we conquer. Therefore, let us arraign whatever political party, whatever religious sect, whatever distinguished man, whatever powerful institution, are found compromising the rights of those in bondage; so shall we keep alive the sacred fire until we shall have abolitionized the whole North. In that hour in vain will the South endeavour to maintain her slave system. She lives as a slave country only because she is allowed to be with us; the moment the North shall make the true issue with the South, it will not be in the power of the South to maintain the system for an hour, and the great jubilee shall have come (applause).

Mr. Foss—Our friend Garrison has alluded to a pamphlet published by Dr. Lord, in which he declares that both natural and revealed religion authorize American slavery, as well as every other system of oppression—because it must go to that extent. Dr. Lord is a representative of the orthodoxy of New Hampshire, more, perhaps, than any other man; and if he had expressed any doubt in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, he could not have maintained his position at the head of Dartmouth College a single year. I know this to be so because they had there once a Professor Hale, who was only an Episcopalian, and, as the college was under the control of Congregationalists in order to oust Professor Hale, who was in the habit of getting the students together and holding prayer meetings, and in other ways propagating the doctrines of his sect, though they did not dare to remove him outright, they abolished his chair; and as soon as he was gone, they set it back again, and put an incumbent in it of the right stripe. Then they had a Professor Crosby, who, upon reading John Foster's letter in regard to the future condition of souls, came to the conclusion that all men would finally be saved; for that heresy they did not stop to remove the chair, but put him out of it. Now Dr. Lord comes forth and says that slaveholding is sanctioned by natural and revealed religion, and piles up texts to prove it; but no fault is found with him for that. I had a conversation with an influential Congregational minister in New Hampshire, a short time since, who professes to be an anti-slavery man. "How is it," I said, "that you can endure Dr. Lord?" "Oh," said he, "he is an imbecile old man; we must excuse him." "An imbecile old man President of Dartmouth College, with four hundred young men constantly under his tuition!" "Oh," said he, "he is imbecile in religion" (laughter). There is a great deal of this imbecility in religion, I take it, in this land. Dr. Lord is not discredited; he is as good a Christian since he wrote that book as before in the estimation of the orthodoxy of New England, and we have as good orthodoxy there as you have anywhere.

But, as has been well observed, your duty in Pennsylvania is at home, and you have your Judge Kane as well as Massachusetts its Dr. Adams and New Hampshire its Dr. Lord. But Judge Kane is not the only man you have of this stripe; you have others, and I am going to call your attention to one of them; it is the Rev. Charles Wadsworth. I paid a quarter of a dollar for a thanksgiving sermon of his, which I hold in my hand, and I told the man who sold it to me that I did not buy it because it was worth it, otherwise than as it was a specimen of Satanic religion; as such it might be worth a quarter. His text is in Esther, 4th chapter, 14th verse: "And who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" He goes on to argue that as Esther was brought to the kingdom at that particular time for the purpose of saving the Jews, so the American people have been brought to the kingdom at this peculiar crisis in the world's history for the world's salvation.

Mr. Foss then proceeded to quote passages from the sermon, in which the preacher attempted to show that America was one of God's great instruments for the world's civil redemption—that this nation was evidently foretold in prophecy as the kingdom that was to break in pieces all other kingdoms and stand forever. Here, said Mr. Foss, is a passage, which, by common consent of the Christian world, has had a spiritual interpretation, referring to a spiritual kingdom, which this remarkable divine has discovered to refer only to Jonathan—or to Sam (laughter). Stand back, Abraham, Moses and all the people of God, and give place to Jonathan; America beats the world all hollow (laughter). We find America predicted, according to this divine, "in Daniel's vision of the great Ancient of Days." Now, as I have been a divine too (though I have got bravely over it, thank God),

I will venture an interpretation; and that is, that we find America predicted in the great Babylon that dealt in purple and fine linen, in gold and silver, and in the souls and bodies of men.

Having thus described our condition, he comes to our duties. Here Mr. Foss read a number of passages, in which the preacher urged the duty of preserving and strengthening our civil institutions; of *crushing every reptile* that dares to whisper of disunion; of branding with the mark of Cain [not of Philadelphia—laughter] every political demagogue who dared to conjure the phantom. The professing Christian who, for the sake of Southern bondmen, dared to preach or pray for disunion should be pitied as a poor lunatic. In regard to our civil immunities, we should first take care of ourselves, in accordance with the law of God, that he that provideth not first for his own [leaving out the word "household"] hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. The preacher had no fear of disunion from popery, nor even from that vexed question of Southern slavery. To the Disunionists he applied the passage of Solomon, "Though you bray a fool in a mortar, yet will not foolishness depart from him." Such were the men who, for the sake of the black men scattered thinly over the continent, would destroy this Confederacy for the abstract right of a poor fragmentary race.

I will not trouble you with any more of this; don't any of you give twenty-five cents for it—you will get cheated. Here you have a religion that deals with the prophecies, that have always been regarded as sacred, in the most trifling manner, applying them to events that he imagines may transpire—events that are to be introduced by the action of a fillibustering people. He finds an excuse, nay, a warrant, for all our fillibustering in the prophecies. God forbid that I should speak sneeringly or lightly of true religion; but that maudlin, whining, snuffling, creed-abiding religion, that is putting its whole weight upon the heart of poor oppressed humanity, I have no fellowship with; and I do solemnly aver that I regard the popular religion of this land as a great barrier in the way of humanity's progress. Just to the extent that the doctrines of this discourse are received in Philadelphia, to that extent is the power of the soul paralyzed for any good work. Some will ask why we thus ridicule this man's religion? We answer, that when we find slavery propped up by religion, we must attack that religion and expose it. Slavery cannot stand on its own merits, and our business is to destroy or reform the sustaining influences of slavery (applause).

Mr. GARRISON remarked that the pamphlet from which brother Foss had been reading reminded him of the anecdote of the drunkard who came home intoxicated late at night, got carefully into bed where his wife had gone before him, and, in order to conceal his intoxication from his wife, turned his face away from her; but she, being awake, said to him, "Jones, it's no use; you needn't turn away; you are drunk clear through" (applause). So with this sermon; it is wicked and corrupt clear through (applause).

Mr. DAVIS thought that the resolution adopted this morning inviting all who may be present, whether opposed to slavery or not, to participate in the discussion, ought to be amended so as to extend the invitation to the author of that sermon or any of his friends to come here and defend it. He doubted whether Mr. Wadsworth would be bold enough to do so, but would stand behind his pulpit and, the next thanksgiving day, perhaps, utter the same sentiments; but perhaps some one might venture to appear here as his champion.

EVENING SESSION.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, being announced as the first speaker of the evening, came forward and said:

It seems to be decided by those who have the ordering of the proceedings this evening that I shall come first, probably upon the principle anciently acted upon when the good wine was kept till the last.

Two resolutions were offered this morning, one of which I propose to make the text of my remarks; the substance of it is, that we renew our protest against slavery, not as an evil merely, but as a sin; not to be deprecated on account of its liability to abuse, but to be denounced as itself the greatest of abuses; not to be mitigated, but to be utterly abolished. The objection of those who stand aloof from us, we are told, is, not on account of our principles, but our measures. The objectors say they are as much opposed to slavery as we are, but they cannot agree with our stern denunciation, severe invective, harsh epithets, revolutionary spirit and stringent measures. Now, I have never met such an objector whose real objection and point of difference was not, after all, in regard to our principles. The objection to measures is simply a logical sequence of the difference from us with regard to principle. It is a great mistake to suppose that there is no need at the present time to press the first principles of anti-slavery upon the attention of the people. The community is not anti-slavery. Is that man anti-slavery who is willing, for the sake of the preservation of the American Union or his ecclesiastical position or political party, to pledge himself to maintain practically the institution of slavery; to be a co-worker with those who rivet the chains upon the limbs of the captive? We say, no. Therefore we believe it is proper to recur to first principles continually. The simple truth of the matter is, that every man who sees slavery as we see it, if he is honest, must believe and feel that ours is the true course. If slavery is a sin and not merely an evil, our doctrine of immediate emancipation is true, and that large class of people who say it would never do to set the slaves free at once, are not only dissenting from us as to measures, but as to principle.

It is a novel doctrine that the criminality of a crime is less in proportion to the superiority of the committer of it over his victim. In that sermon which was read to us this afternoon, slavery was treated as a very small matter, in the oppression of a comparatively few black men, scattered sparsely over our broad continent, for the sake of fulfilling God's designs in our country. So it comes to this: that stealing is more or less criminal in proportion as the position of the person you steal from is high or low; that he who steals a penny from the coffers of affluence ought to be sent to prison, but he who takes it from the close gripe of starving poverty should not be treated as guilty of the crime of theft; that it would be indecorous to be so forgetful of the broad and necessary distinctions of class and caste among men as to lower the perpetrator of the act to the level of the man who picks the pocket of a millionaire; that we must not endanger this grand experiment of fulfilling the prophecies, by too great zeal in behalf of an enterprise which would rather make us fulfil the Gospel and the law. Well, it is a fine thing to be a theologian and to be skilled in expounding the prophets. Now, we still insist that men who make the maintenance of this Union paramount to the cause of liberty do not agree with us in opinion as to the character of slavery. They do not believe that it is impossible to hold slaves without violating the Divine law and trampling upon human rights; unless it is possible, in this day of boasted Christian illumination, for a man to be ignorant of the real character of the deed he commits when he holds his fellow-man as a slave. If you will find me a man who is not settled in his own mind as to whether it would be a crime to make *him* a slave—to compel him to work without wages, to fetter his conscience, to smother his intellect and crush his soul—then I will not insist upon it that that man knows he is incurring any guilt by becoming a slaveholder; but in that case, if such a case is possible, he escapes the guilt only through his ignorance.

The great argument, now-a-days, in favour of slaveholding is, "the glorious Union"; that stands for logic, theology, common sense and decency. Say anything about the wrong of slavery, and the answer to it is "the glorious Union," and there is an end of the whole controversy. Well, I don't know that there is much to be gained in replying to that argument, for somebody has said that that which a man has got into his head unreasonably, you cannot very well reason out of it. But it does seem sometimes as if it were worth while to say a word about even such an absurdity. At all events, we may again insist that he who uses this reply to the arguments of anti-slavery men shows that he differs from us in first principles, not merely about slavery, but fundamental morality. We affirm that slavery is not to be deprecated merely on account of its abuses, but because it is itself the greatest of all abuses. Many seem to think that our objection to slavery is on account of the cruelties which the slave suffers, and tell us that they should not be charged upon the system itself, which is not so very bad after all. What sort of logic is that which begins by saying, I am as much opposed to slavery as you, and ends by saying that it is not in itself an abuse? We complain of the cruelties and wrongs which the slave suffers, but only as incidental and secondary; the burden of our complaint is against slavery itself, which turns men into marketable commodities and binds them to their task as beasts of burden; which converts our brother man and the child of our infinite Father into a mere machine of industry. My neighbour says, "You are uncharitable in denouncing that kind and benevolent slaveholder, who feeds and clothes his slaves well, does not whip them and takes care of them in old age." I say to him, Does he not treat his slave as property? What guarantee, then, can you give me that he will not abuse them to-morrow if he does not to-day? The man that is so kind-hearted that he would not treat his slave severely would not treat a free labourer severely. Slavery, therefore, deserves no credit for the kind treatment of that master. Then as to the *interest* of the master in treating his slave kindly, there is just the point where the atrocity and wickedness of the institution is manifest. You compare a man to a beast; for as it is a man's interest to feed and shelter his beast, and to attend to all his wants, that he may be valuable as an article of property, so, for the very same reason, will a man feed and clothe and shelter his slave. Am I to give him or his system credit for that? I go into a neighbour's house that looks as if it needed repair, and was capable of being made a good house, as it was, evidently, originally. I lay my hand upon the owner, thrust him down the cellar and bind him fast, and then proceed to renovate the habitation. Having done so, I appropriate it to my own use, while I keep the owner of it down cellar starving. I then boast of what I have done to restore and beautify the habitation and challenge admiration of my kindness in doing so, claiming to be a benefactor to the occupant of the house. But says my neighbour, "Where is the man to whom you are such a benefactor?" He is down cellar starving to death. That is my kindness. You pronounce me a monster of cruelty. Take care, I say, do not use harsh epithets; you are unjust in not commending my kindness in what I have done for the outward habitation. That is slavery in its best aspect—free from all these alleged abuses. Is it not the greatest of all abuses? Am I not abusing you more when I starve you to death than if I should set myself to batter down your dwelling, set fire to it and consume it to ashes? (Applause.)

It would not be difficult to show that all the so-called abuses of slavery flow inevitably and naturally from this fountain, the holding of man as property. You are going to subject a man to the condition of a beast; you politely request him to allow you to do so for the sake of increasing the contents of your money-chest by the amount of his market value. He refuses. What then? Will he surrender because you tell him the Constitution requires it? What cares he for your Constitution? Will he surrender to preserve "the glorious Union"? What cares he for that, while he has no liberty under it? He does not want a Union that makes the oppressor powerful and himself weak. You then try the theological argument, and expound to him the prophecies about the destiny of this nation. What does he care for your prophecies? If they are true, they will be fulfilled without his submission; but, if his refusal will prevent their fulfilment, he has some reason to suspect they are not true prophecies (laughter). Then you argue from the laws of Moses and the teachings of Paul and Peter that he is bound to be a servant. What cares he for a religion that enslaves him? You may read to him the epistle of Paul to Philemon, and endeavour to persuade him of his duty to submit to be enslaved; before you have finished your discourse, he will do as a congregation of slaves once did when a missionary was undertaking to prove that it was a sin for a slave to run away; about the time he got to that point, half the congregation turned on their heel and left the house and the other half looked as though they did n't believe half he said; and some said they did n't believe there was such a chapter as the one he was reading, or that he did n't read it right (laughter). So they discussed, it, all the time referring to those simple principles of justice which were written in their own hearts by the finger of God, and came to the conclusion that the minister was cheating them. Find me the master that is willing to trust his tenure to his slave-property to the mere power of logic or theology upon the mind of his slave. You cannot have slavery without physical cruelty. Nay, I go further and affirm that a *large measure* of physical cruelty is absolutely necessary to keep the slaves in subjection. I affirm also that even that physical cruelty which is not absolutely necessary as a part of the plantation discipline is no more an abuse of slavery than the apples you gather from the apple tree are an abuse of the tree that bore them; they are the legitimate fruit of the institution. You remember what Jefferson said on this point: the intercourse of master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, and that man must be a prodigy who can maintain his morals and manners uncontaminated under such circumstances. Years ago, I read a book written by a Virginia clergyman before this anti-slavery agitation commenced, in which he said, that what is called kind treatment of the slaves is that which no free servant would submit to. There is no mitigation of slavery; the milder you make it, the greater injury you have done to the slave; if he should be subjected to the greatest measures of cruelty compatible with the system, we should very soon see the end of slavery.

There is no man who would not resent it as the worst of insults if you were to ask him to go into partnership for the purpose of robbing, stealing, opening houses of infamy and bartering female purity for gold. Ask a man to enter into such a partnership and he would kick you out of his house. Is a crime any the less because it is perpetrated on a grand scale? For a man to attempt to palliate the wrong of slavery by telling us how comparatively few are the victims, only proves the moral blindness and obtuseness which has come upon us in consequence of our connection with slavery. Then let us bear our testimony against the institution, not merely as an abuse, but as the greatest of all abuses, not to be dealt [illegible]

Mr. GARRISON followed with a speech of some length and great force and ability, which we regret to be obliged to condense for want of room. He said it was an old adage that it was a foul bird that dirtied its own nest. Of this act the slaveholding South was never guilty. He did not marvel at all at anything the Slave Power had done or was doing; it was all for the sake of the darling institution. In fact, the slaveholders did not go far enough. They ought to demand that all the coin of the land should be melted up, because it is one-sided; it is wholly Northern. In other words, it was "liberty" which was stamped on the face of our eagle, dollar and cent, and nothing about slavery was there (applause). For the sake of equality, therefore, the South ought to insist that all the coin should have the word "slavery" stamped on the other side (applause).

Then they ought to abolish the celebration of the 4th of July, as on that day all the orators talk about liberty and not a word in eulogy of slavery; at least, they ought to insist as a condition of union, that whenever and wherever liberty is spoken of, there should slavery also be remembered and properly eulogized. So that, instead of the South going too far, on the whole she does not go far enough.

The first article of the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania declares that all men are equally free and independent, and have certain natural and inherent rights, among which are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and, in a word, seeking and obtaining happiness. This Society has never gone one hair's breadth beyond the letter or spirit of that article. Every man who swears to support that Constitution and at the same time justifies slavery, is a political hypocrite, and condemned out of his own mouth. It is impossible for a man to be a Christian or an honest man and hold his fellow-man in bondage. The more a man becomes imbued with the spirit which animated Jesus, the more he approximates to the spirit of God, the less does he wish to rule and reign over his fellow-men and the more willingly does he become the servant of men.

How do we stand at the North? There are few who boldly defend slavery; it is left to the South to vindicate it on principle. But how are we going to abolish slavery? There are certain conditions requisite to success. The South presents an unbroken front, but the North is full of schism. Tell me not that the army of the North is large; the confusion and the route will be so much the more disastrous. It is a union in feeling and sentiment which will achieve the victory, and nothing else. Such is the unity of the South that all opposition is overborne there. There is no freedom of speech. All is death; men crawl about, with padlocks on their lips, to find dishonourable graves. The slaveholders, themselves the worst of slaves, are afraid of each other. The thief doth fear each bush an officer; so it is at the South.

But at the North we are divided. The Democratic party is, in a great measure, shorn of its strength, but still it is a very powerful party and thoroughly pro-slavery, and hence is, in every free State, just so much treason in our camp; we cannot proceed against the enemy with any hope of success with such a powerful pro-slavery party among us. Then the Whig party—that is, all that remains of its fragments—is also diabolically pro-slavery. Then there is the Know-Nothing party; never was a party more appropriately named; for if it had any true knowledge of Catholicism, it would know that in our country it is intensely pro-slavery. Catholicism is truly American, so far as our *peculiar* institution is concerned. The Slave Power relies upon the Catholics as a breakwater against the waves of freedom. It is a great mistake to talk about the power of the Pope in other than spiritual matters. He is powerful in all things pertaining to conscience; the immaculate conception, when once affirmed, must not be doubted, and Catholics will sustain it to the death. But, when he tells them to do a moral act—to cease to strike hands with tyrants or slaveholders—they laugh him to scorn. I am not talking at random. Popes have repeatedly issued their bulls against slavery and the slave trade; but did you ever know a Catholic give any heed to them? No, the slaveholding Catholic tells the Pope to mind his business; he means to keep his negroes whether he goes to heaven or not. In regard to slavery, you will not find the Pope at Rome, but in the Slave Power. The Know-Nothings should remember that Protestant America made war upon Catholic Mexico, that had emancipated her slaves; stole Texas from her and reëstablished slavery there. And Catholic France, in 1848, declared freedom to all the slaves in her colonies; and Catholic Austria proclaimed to the slaves of America, Cuba and Brazil, that every slave that touched the deck of an Austrian ship or any part of Austrian soil was free and should be protected against the world. Catholicism in our country is dangerous only because of slavery.

Then there is the Republican or Fusion party. Does it contemplate the abolition of slavery? Not at all; it is a party simply to prevent the aggressions of the Slave Power. It was only saying to the South, "If you advance any further, we will bite our fingers at you" (laughter). That is not anti-slavery.

Mr. G. then briefly noticed the Liberty party, who believed that every word of the Constitution was anti-slavery, and would abolish slavery in every part of the country, if enforced. He then maintained that the Constitution was a compact just such as its founders intended it should be. He contended that slaveholding created a necessity for the dissolution of the Union—as the South had resolved to have no fellowship with Northern men who believed that slavery was a curse. We should have no connection with slaveholders religiously, because they will belong to no churches which proclaim slavery a sin against God. When we find a church receiving slaveholders at the communion table, we should get out of that church just as quick as Lot got out of Sodom—for it is Anti-Christ.

He would give the following reasons for going out of the Union:

Because the institutions of the North are utterly antagonistical to those of the South.

Because all of the violence and heart-burning which mark our land are found wherever the line runs along the Southern States: we find no conflict between Maine and Iowa.

Because slavery lives only by Northern industry and labour—it is a great robber—it cannot get enough out of the soil to pay even the letter postage of the South.

Because, the Union dissolved, the South would be obliged to free her slaves, and then Virginia and Ohio would be on the same footing, and the same in all things.

Because Almighty God has made it impossible for freedom and slavery to be united.

Because, while the slaveholders have a territory that they can call their own, we are denied our right to a land that belongs to us, unless we wear a padlock on our lips. The Southern man can come here and defend slavery, but the Northern man who attempts to speak of freedom will find only the Union which brings a rope about his neck. Such a Union is a despotism! And he referred to the fact that the Bible Society has refused to receive a donation of $5,000 to print Bibles for the South; and also that the Tract Society dared not distribute tracts in the Southern States.

Because we have not equal rights under this Union. In elucidating this position, Mr. Garrison cited numerous instances of cruelty which had been practiced towards Northern men whose business called them South.

Because there was no freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of thought or action out of the North—nothing but slavery, dark on every side.

Because the Bible is not allowed a free circulation. Now, you are a Christian people. Souls you believe are going to hell in a foreign country, and you send them Bibles. Will you refuse those in darkness on your own soil?

Because, while we remain, we are subject to insult and degradation, and our own manhood should demand a dissolution.

Because the infamy and guilt of the Government are made national under one Constitution, one flag and one Union:

Because the South declares inexorably what the conditions of the Union shall be.

Because compliance with those conditions is sin and shame.

Mr. Garrison closed by quoting an eloquent poem of Whittier, which was received with great enthusiasm.

The Convention then adjourned till to-morrow morning.

SECOND DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

Mr. MCKIM read the minutes of the proceedings of yesterday.

On motion by Mr. McKim, the following persons were appointed a Committee to nominate officers of the Society for the ensuing year: Benj. C. Bacon, Simon Barnard, [illegible]

HENRY GREW then took the stand upon the resolutions which were under consideration when the Convention adjourned last evening. Mr. Grew denounced the institution of slavery as utterly opposed to the inalienable rights of humanity. He had no honeyed words for slavery; but in attempting the abolition of slavery, we must understand the subject. He thought that although he was even more opposed to slavery than Mr. Garrison, according to that gentleman's statement, yet sometimes the cause was injured by our not making proper discrimination in regard to our opponents. A portion of the Christian Church thought that slavery, although an evil, should be tolerated on the ground of expediency. Now, although the speaker thought these people wrong, yet he thought we should not treat them as if they were our worst enemies. Paul once thought he was doing God's service in persecuting the saints; but he sinned through ignorance.

Our object being to convince every one of the evils of slavery, we can best accomplish the object by argument and not by denunciation. We should be careful not to excite the prejudice of members of churches, by talking as if we were opposed to the preaching of the Gospel—which is an anti-slavery Gospel, we all allow. The speaker then referred to the recent Thanksgiving Sermon of Rev. Mr. Wadsworth, which was the main topic of the evening session of yesterday. He criticised the sermon mildly, and then referred to some remarks of Mr. Foss, in the previous session of the Convention. The speaker thought that Mr. F. should not have spoken so slightingly as he had done of the preaching of the Gospel, and of Divine things generally. His remarks were directed personally (through the chairman) at Mr. Foss, who took the stand immediately on the conclusion of Mr. Grew's remarks.

Mr. Foss said, in regard to his sentiments in reference to preaching the Gospel, he thought that what he had said was perfectly right. He was glad that he had got out of that horrible pit of miry clay—sectarian preaching. But he thought that he preached a little of the Gospel yesterday, and he meant to preach a little more of it to-day. What he meant by saying he had got bravely over being a divine was that he was no longer a sectarian priest—an iron-sided, hard-shell Baptist, one set apart to that particular office and nothing else. And brother Grew, he thought, could appreciate such a deliverance as this, for he objected emphatically to the prefix of Reverend to his name.

Mr. GREW—Because it is a title applied to the Almighty alone; I am a minister of the Gospel.

Mr. Foss—Does brother Grew claim any title or authority to preach that is not conferred upon every other man that has the capacity?

Mr. GREW—No; every Christian should be a preacher of the Gospel.

Mr. Foss—Then you and I will have no controversy. Now, brother Grew says that Paul sinned ignorantly, and that the slaveholders are like him. But there is a difference. Paul thought that the Christians he persecuted were criminals; but there is not a slaveholder alive that does not know what a crime it is to hold a slave. If Paul had undertaken to put those Christians in jail and to death because they did not happen to have just such a coloured skin as he, he could not have acted ignorantly. But he believed the Christians that he persecuted were criminals and had committed overt acts. No man ever did or ever can believe that slavery is right for himself. Suppose it were possible for me to make Dr. Lord believe that I had it in my power to make him a slave, henceforth to exercise no right of his own, but at my will; do you think that, with all his learning, he would find a passage in Leviticus or Paul's epistle that would authorize the act? I ask brother Grew if the man lives who, under such circumstances, would believe slavery right?

Mr. GREW—No.

Mr. Foss—Then it is not the sin of ignorance, and I cannot bate one particle of denunciation. Now, it seems to me it is owing to a wrong state of moral perception when any one attempts to apologize for those who justify or palliate slavery. We do not do it in regard to any other crime.

Mr. GARRISON—It is because the sin is respectable.

Mr. Foss—Well, I want to make it disgraceful. Brother Grew, it seems to me, is not taking the right course to make slavery disreputable. It would be better to let the truth come down red-hot upon the hearts of those poor sinners and hold it on there and let it sizzle (laughter). I know they will feel the pain and writhe, but it is the only way to make them leave off sinning. I attribute nothing wrong to brother Grew, unless it is an excess of goodness (laughter); and I think it is always best to have just the right measure of everything.

I have nothing to retract; the readers of the newspapers will understand me when I say I have got bravely over being a divine, as meaning such a divine as Dr. Lord and Mr. Wadsworth—as getting over being a preacher of that religion which has divorced itself from humanity. Instead of taking that title any more, I mean to try to so live that my life shall be divine (applause).

Mr. GREW reiterated his views, saying that the man who commits murder when intoxicated was not as criminal as when sober. He appealed to the audience if he was not correct.

THOMAS WHITSON then took the platform, and related an anecdote of a neighbour of his and his minister. His neighbour told him that he met the minister one day who was very much concerned for the salvation of his soul, and accosted him thus: "Christopher, some time ago I urged you to come to my church, but since then I have never seen you there; I am very sorry." The man replied—"I am a foreigner; when I came to this country, I was told it was a land of liberty, where I could have a voice in the Government. Well, I was anxious to be a party in such a Government, and so I went and took a solemn oath to support the Constitution of the country. But when I came to examine that Constitution, I found that it was a piratical Constitution and a piratical Government. Now, I am afraid to go to hear a Christian sermon, lest I should be tempted to break that oath; therefore I don't go to church."

Now, I think if the man had examined a little further into the Christian gospel of this country, as he did into the Constitution, he would have found that that was no better than the Constitution. You have all read the story of the man who travelled from Jericho to Jerusalem, and fell among thieves and was robbed, and left naked and half dead; and the priest, passing by in a good deal of a hurry (having to go and preach a sermon, or attend a baptism, or some other important duty), passed by; and the Levite, too, having some urgent business, could not stop; but the good Samaritan came along and found time to attend to him. Some who read this story may conclude that it is the doctrine preached in our churches, and, perhaps, my neighbour, having the same impression, feared that it would be an inducement for him to break his oath. But this is an error. The robbers of this country have improved in the business. Instead of stripping their victim and leaving him half dead, they have so managed that he shall be kept alive, so that they can make more out of him, and they have continued to rob him as fast as he has acquired anything. Now, suppose some of these robbers at the South had got hold of a man and robbed him not only of his property, but his intellect and morals. The man in passing from Washington to New York is discovered near this city, in this wretched condition. The priest and the Levite are too busy to attend to his case. But there is one person who can neglect his business long enough to go and try to deliver him from the hands of the robbers, and he is successful. The robbers then go to Pontius Pilate and enter a complaint against the good Samaritan. Pilate has got worse than he used to be, and, instead of finding no fault with him, and trying to release him, knowing that the people are not clamorous for his condemnation, but are rather anxious to let him go, and fearing that if he trusts the case to them, instead of crucifying him, they will rather let him go, he raises the cry himself of "crucify him," and assumes to judge the case himself. The man is condemned, and the judge, unlike Judas, who repented of his deed at once, takes three months, and then only repents half way. Now, one would suppose that, if this man was to go to a Christian church in this place, he would get rebuked for his treatment of the Samaritan. Not so. Sermons are preached against Cain for slaying his brother, but not against the Kanes of our own time. So it would be perfectly safe for my neighbour to attend church; he would be in no danger of being tempted to break his oath to the Constitution (applause).

LUCRETIA MOTT rose to say a few words in regard to the denunciations heaped upon Mr. Wadsworth. It seemed to her that he was too much singled out from the many in this city who were preaching similar doctrines. Some of us had heard little else all our lives, even in our Quaker churches, in regard to slavery, than that the Lord, in his own good time, was going to abolish it, and that good works and humanity towards the slave were not Christianity or religion. Mr. Wadsworth was not a sinner above all men; nearly all our preachers must come under just [illegible] friend Foss.

Mrs. M. regretted that during all the wholesome excitement in reference to the imprisonment of Williamson, though there were efforts made in the churches to arouse them to a sense of the wrong and to take some action upon the subject, it was in vain. Seven meetings for "sufferings," as they are called, were held in the course of two weeks, and, though efforts were made by some twenty or thirty to do something, nothing was done. She spoke of this because, though Williamson was not himself identified with the Orthodox Quaker Society (probably for having married a Hicksite), his father was. She regretted the apathy which existed and hoped this subject would be put more prominently before this Convention (applause).

WM. LLOYD GARRISON next rose and directed his remarks to the admonitions which have been given us to discriminate among pro-slavery people and apologists for slavery. Slavery, he said, had made itself respectable, and those who own slaves or who apologize for slavery are generally highly respectable men. We do not apologize for criminals in general, although criminals in general need a large share of our sympathies; but Christ, whose name is on the lips of all who attend the churches, uttered his fiercest denunciations against the respectable sinners of the time—"the Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." We all agree that no man in the Northern States ought to own a slave here, yet we alter our sentiments when we speak of the Southern States.

Mr. G. argued at some length to show that slavery under some circumstances was equivalent to slavery under all circumstances; and that if you believe the one is right, you must believe the other is right also. When he heard a man vindicating slavery, he started from him as from a rattlesnake. Our moral nature ought to be stirred to its utmost depths in view of such doctrines. The slave code was the best index of the character of the system, and was itself as kind as the circumstances would admit. That code was more horrible than Draco's, which was written in human blood, and who ever heard of any slaveholder making war upon that code? If there were humane slaveholders, they were opposed to the slave code. Where was one to be found? He contended that the Abolitionists were the best friends of the slaveholder. He said that he had frequently had calls from slaveholders at the office of his newspaper; and that although they had frequently said they would like to take it, he had always told them it was of no use to send it. And though they said he was mistaken, that they could take any paper they pleased, the result had been, invariably, that the paper was sent back.

Mr. MCKIM here rose and stated that the Anti-Slavery Society would need, during the ensuing year, at least $1,000 to carry on its operations. After a strong appeal in behalf of the Society, it was proposed that a Finance Committee of four be appointed to solicit subscriptions from the friends of the cause who were present.

The Committee were accordingly appointed, consisting of Prof. Thomas, George Orr, Isaac Flint and J. M. McKim, and they proceeded immediately to take contributions and pledges.

ROBERT PURVIS rose to say that he hoped the remark of Mr. Garrison, that the Abolitionists were the best friends of the slaveholder, would not be misunderstood. While they were, in the true sense of the word, friends of the slaveholder, it should not be forgotten that they regarded slaveholders as scoundrels and tyrants (applause).

Mr. DAVIS wished to give credit to the *Philadelphia Times*, *Enquirer* and *Ledger*, for giving tolerably true reports of the proceedings of this Convention, without design to misrepresent it.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Rev. HENRY B. TAYLOR came forward and took exception to the remarks of Mr. Garrison, that a slaveholder could not be a Christian. He thought there might be a few—a precious few. He thought the charges too sweeping in regard to pro-slavery ministers and Christians, and he instanced Dr. Lord, of Buffalo, New York, who had always given very good evidence of having been regenerated. He (Mr. T.) was an Orthodox Congregationalist; he did not believe the Bible sanctioned slavery at all. He had always been an anti-slavery man and believed slavery to be the sum of villanies. He had done what he could, for years past, in Evans, N. Y., where he resided, to help fugitives to Canada.

OLIVER JOHNSON said that the last speaker had made a bad selection of a specimen of a Christian pro-slavery man, when he referred to the Rev. Mr. Lord as such. He had been foremost among the body to which he belonged to endorse the Fugitive Slave law by baptizing it in the name of Christ. If we accepted him, certainly we must make up our minds to take in the whole body of the clergy of the United States.

Rev. CHAUNCY WEBSTER, of Philadelphia, said that if we recognised the principle that God alone searches the heart, we would not presume to judge who are Christians and who are not; it was the prerogative of the Almighty. But we have an infallible rule in regard to slavery; and if a man walks not according to that rule, we should have no fellowship with him. We know that slavery is the very essence of diabolism; and if a man is found defending it, it is nothing to us what may be his standing in the sight of God—we must have no fellowship with him, but must denounce him, in the words of Divine authority, as an enemy of God and man.

Mr. W. stated that there were something like one hundred congregations of Reformed Presbyterians in the United States (called by some Covenanters) that never fellowshipped the slaveholder. Then there were some two hundred congregations of Seceders, who, though they once had slavery among them, in 1830 declared that no slaveholder should be entitled to membership in their church. Besides these, there were some two or three hundred congregations of Associate Reformed Presbyterians that took high ground in regard to slavery, making in all some five or six hundred congregations. There were some among them who had long laboured to convince them of the duty to separate entirely from all connection with the Government.

GEORGE ORR said the Covenanters, to whom he belonged, had never taken any part in the Government. They were anti-slavery long before any Convention of this kind was held in this country, and never permitted a slaveholder to have communion with them. They were the oldest Anti-Slavery Society, he believed, in the United States.

Mr. O. here read some resolutions recently passed by the Philadelphia Presbytery of that church, taking radical and strong anti-slavery ground, and remarked that other Presbyteries had adopted similar sentiments. He then spoke of the early attempts to hold anti-slavery meetings in Ohio, where he resided, when they were mobbed and egged; but he was happy to know that the very man who bought the eggs and led the mob was, last Summer, shouting "huzza for Chase!" He denied that it was possible to be a good slaveholder. Speaking of fugitive slaves, he thought they did n't know much about them here compared with what he had seen in Ohio, where they were sent along in broad daylight—frequently twenty a day.

Mr. DAVIS and others here interrupted the speaker by stating that they had passed along the Pennsylvania underground railroad at the rate of twenty a day, and that friend Garrett, of Delaware, who was present, had helped away 1956.

Mr. ORR—That is a good agent (laughter), and I don't know but I shall have to knock under to my old friend. As regards Judge Kane, Mr. O. thought it would be as impossible for him to live in Ohio as for a fish to live out of water (laughter).

Mr. MCKIM then offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in the case of Passmore Williamson we have such a revelation of the spirit and purposes of the Slave Power, and such an exhibition of the judicial subserviency thereto, as should excite general alarm and indignation and call forth universal reprobation and earnest resistance.

Resolved, That John H. Wheeler, in bringing his slaves to this State and attempting to hold them here and to take them hence as slaves, in open contempt of Pennsylvania statutes and the well-established principles of international common law, committed a flagrant crime, and deserved rather the penalty of a kidnapper than the aid and countenance of the ministers of the law.

Resolved, That in all which Passmore Williamson did to prevent the consummation of Wheeler's criminal design, he acted both lawfully and laudably; and has, as he deserves, our warm approval for this manifestation of his characteristic promptitude and fidelity.

Resolved, That our hearty commendation is also due, and is given, to those brave and generous men who, prompted only by their quick sympathy with the victims of wrong, interposed, with such alacrity and efficiency, for the deliverance of the kidnapper's intended prey from his grasp.

Resolved, That Judge Kane, in attempting to interfere judicially in the case at all, usurped a jurisdiction not belonging to him and, in the mode of exercising that usurped jurisdiction, was guilty of still farther and exceedingly gross violation of law and justice.

Resolved, That in imprisoning Williamson upon the false charge of contempt of Court, for having made a full, true and respectful return to his illegally issued writ, he prostituted the forms of law to the persecution of an upright man, guilty of no wrong, either substantial or technical; proved himself to be a lawless tyrant, a willing tool of the paramount despotism of the Slave Power, and an object for the reprobation of all honest men.

Resolved, That in accepting at last, as a "purgation of the alleged contempt," a substantial repetition of the very statement which [illegible] confessed the falsehood of the original charge, and the injustice and illegality of the original imprisonment.

Resolved, That the four judges of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court who concurred in refusing to redress the wrong of which Judge Kane was guilty became partakers of his wrongdoing and his guilt, and ought to share with him his richly-merited infamy.

Resolved, That Judges Black and Lewis especially, by the terms in which they expressed their refusal, added insult to injury, and blended falsehood, slander, and cruelty, with recreancy to judicial duty.

Resolved, That we rejoice to note one exception to the recreancy of the Supreme Court Judges, and cordially to commend the attitude of Judge Knox, in standing singly for the right, and manfully vindicating the violated laws, in his dissenting opinion.

Resolved, That if the doctrine laid down by the majority of the Court, that the judgement of a Federal Court in a case of alleged contempt cannot be questioned or reviewed by the State Court, be law, and so to be received and acted on throughout the country, then we are all, in effect, the subjects of an absolute despotism, with no legal protection against any tyranny which the judicial agents of a slaveholding and slavery-propagating national government may choose to exercise upon us.

Resolved, That we see in this case an illustration of the character of the American Union, and the impossibility of preserving liberty for ourselves while we remain in a Union with slaveholders.

Resolved, That the motto of the American Anti-Slavery Society—"No Union with Slaveholders, religiously or politically"—is based upon a moral necessity, sound philosophy, and the eternal fitness of things; is merely affirming that Christ and Belial cannot coalesce for common objects; is but meeting in principle and in the right spirit the universal outcry of the slaveholders of the South—"no fellowship with Abolitionists, nor any quarter to Abolitionism"—and therefore presents the only vital issue to the country for the maintenance of civil and religious liberty, and the overthrow of slavery and the slave trade.

Mrs. MOTT stated that the result of the collections was the raising of about half the amount required.

Mr. WHITSON was willing to double his pledge. He knew of nothing that paid better than money invested in this cause. Anti-slavery was the salt of the nation, and nothing would do so much for the nation as to buy salt. The Church and the Government had gone so far in putrefaction that salt could not save them; instead of benefiting them, the salt was only wasted; so they now applied the salt to that which was not so far gone. The Abolitionists were salting true religion to keep it from spoiling.

THOMAS HAMBLETON made a few remarks contrasting the condition of the anti-slavery cause twenty years ago with what it is now. Then they were assailed by mobs in this city and elsewhere; now everything was quiet, and they were allowed to assemble in peace. The efforts of the anti-slavery people had brought about this change.

Mr. BURLEIGH—Most of you who sit before me are, no doubt, familiar with the facts of the case to which the resolutions refer; yet, it may not be amiss to say a few words upon the subject. It is not on the bearing of this tyrannical action of Judge Kane upon Passmore Williamson alone that we denounce it; it is because through Judge Kane your rights and mine are trampled upon, imposing upon us the necessity of preparing ourselves for earnest and manly resistance. If the law as presented by Judge Kane is to be received as correct, then any man who dares to inform any slave brought into Pennsylvania that he is free by the laws of the State may be cast into a felon's cell, with no possibility of coming out, or even having his case inquired into, except at the will of the Judge who sent him there. I am glad that the people are constrained to see more clearly than hitherto what we have been telling them all along in regard to the relations of slavery and the pretended freedom of the North. Nothing is clearer than that the liberty of the entire North (if it deserves that name) is in imminent peril. The slaveholder claims to carry his slaves into every part of the Union—upon your railroads and steamboats, and it may be to attend upon him when he spends his Summer season at Northern watering places, or for the purpose of prosecuting the internal (infernal, it may well be termed) slave trade; for, if you admit the principle of Judge Kane, that the slave is recognised as property by the Constitution of the United States, which the owner has a right to take in his transit across the country, then you admit whatever application of the principle he chooses to make. He may come merely as Minister to Nicaragua, barely halting a few hours at Philadelphia, or to spend the Summer at Bedford Springs, Newport or Saratoga. There is no distinction in the law of nations between the carrying of property in transit thought the territory of a friendly State and the residing with that property in that State. If I have a right by the law of nations to carry my property into Canada in transit, I have the same right to stop in Canada with it. According to Judge Kane, it would violate the law of nations for the British Government to confiscate my property in transit; would it not equally violate the law of nations to confiscate my property when I take it there to reside? The logic proves too much—not more than he intends, perhaps, but rather more than he intends the people of Pennsylvania shall see that it proves.

But what is this new doctrine of international law discovered by Judge Kane (which he ought to claim as his own on the principle of common law, by which newly discovered land belongs to the discoverer)—what is it worth in Canada? Let a slaveholder try the experiment of carrying his gang of slaves from Maryland through the North and thence through Canada, by the way of the Great Western Railroad, and thence down the Mississippi to Texas—which, though not the shortest, is, perhaps, a more expeditious route than plodding on foot through the South—what will be the consequence? The suspension bridge at Niagara will hardly have ceased to vibrate with the weight imposed upon it before his slaves will have been declared free by the laws of the British Empire. Who will dare look John Bull in the face and ask him to give back those slaves? Cushing, Marcy, Davis nor Buchanan, would have the madness to propose such a thing in the name of international law. Let a slave go to France or to despotic Austria, and who would think of trying to reclaim him? It is surprising that

but the farmer having discovered it placed the log in such a way that when the hog tried the next time, he was surprised to find himself on the outside instead of the inside of the field when he got through (laughter). To the careless observer it might seem that the hog would get into the corn-field as before, but by laying the log across the outer angle of the zig-zag fence he was made to come out on the outside. So Judge Black, when he got into the argumentation, seemed to be coming to some legal conclusion, but, after all, he comes out into the same mud-hole he started from; the practical conclusion is that the State Court will not meddle with the matter, but will leave the victim to perish. What is the business of a Court of justice but to give clean victories and clean defeats?

The effect of these several propositions which the Slave Power seems likely to establish is to break down every bulwark against the encroachments of despotic power; the very instruments wherewith we have been wont to defend our personal freedom are used to enslave us. Is it not time for us to be making some resistance—not the resistance of arms and physical force, but of the moral power of a clear, enlightened public opinion? By that alone is our liberty to be achieved; I say achieved, because we have not yet secured to ourselves the right to be men in our own households and on our own soil, which we have been so long calling free. I am not free if I cannot do that which the laws of God exact of me without running the risk of fine and imprisonment, of occupying a felon's cell. Our fathers had plenty of that sort of freedom before they came here.

Our resolutions say that the action of Judge Kane was a usurpation all through. It was a case either of person or property. The laws declaring that person free, there is an end of all controversy about enslavement. But if it was property, then it was a case for the Pennsylvania State Courts and not for the United States District Court. Then we go on to affirm that the State Court is in the same condemnation, because it is a participant in the same crime. What I have said heretofore proves that point. Then, further, we declare, if the decision of Judge Kane is law, that there is an end of our legal protection for our rights and we are the subjects of absolute despotism.

What then remains? The last proposition in the resolutions is, that herein we behold the character of the American Union and the impossibility of maintaining liberty for ourselves while we continue in this connection. The anti-slavery and the pro-slavery machinery of this Government cannot work together. If you permit the anti-slavery machinery to work, slavery will not submit; if you balance the two, you check the wheels of government; in order, therefore, that the Government shall go forward, it must be administered either by one party or the other. Whichever preponderates will bring it over to itself. At present the wheels are blocked and will be until there is such a coalition of certain factions as to secure the ascendancy to one or the other party. They say extremes sometimes meet. Those who denounce the no-government men are themselves trying the experiment of carrying on the Government. I repeat that one or the other of these influences must prevail, and whichever prevails drives the other to the wall. Hence you cannot have a union with slaveholders but upon condition of the surrender of your liberties. If you would keep your influence, you must destroy slavery. Our principles have been arrayed before the people of this country for the last twenty years, until he must be wilfully blind who does not see them. Judge ye if there be any other liberty-defending course—any other manly, well-principled course than this: No Union with slaveholders (applause).

Mr. E. M. Davis then read the Treasurer's Report, from which we learn that the receipts from October 1st, 1854, to October 1st, 1855, were as follows:

Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society,	$1,200 00
Individual subscriptions and collections,	2,219 09
Publishing Agent,	1,895 00
Sales,	295 39
Balance from 1854,	8 00
	$5,617 48

The payments are as follows:

Agents,	$1,360 00
Lectures,	204 00
American Society for Standard,	3,000 00
Rent of Office,	175 00
Sundries—Books, Printing, Postage, &c., &c.	852 02
	$5,592 02
Balance on hand,	$25 46

The Convention then adjourned till to-morrow morning, omitting an evening session to attend the Fair.

THIRD DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

After reading the minutes of yesterday's proceedings, Mr. CHAUNCY WEBSTER took the stand and explained the position of the religious body to which he belonged, in regard to slavery. Their principles were identical with this Society. The cause they were engaged in was as high above sectarianism as the heavens are high above the earth. It was a question of God or no God, in fact. All denominations of professing Christians could and should meet on this platform. The people had been deceived with regard to the Abolitionists. Fifteen or twenty years ago he was taught to regard friend Garrison as a kind of grizzly bear that had escaped from the Rocky mountains and found refuge in Boston. There was nothing very savage about his appearance—only his bump of firmness was pretty high. He believed this country was more indebted for what little liberty remains in it to the labours of Mr. Garrison than any other man (applause). The great body of the Church had become as corrupt as the Church of Rome in the days of Luther. It should be kept before the people that this cause was high above all sectarianism.

Further appeals were now made for pecuniary aid.

Mr. GARRISON said the slaveholders regarded the question of finance as a test question in regard to the sincerity of Abolitionists. The liquor league of this city had raised the sum of $100,000 for the purpose of defeating a law restraining the sale of liquor, and they had succeeded. That was the way in which the spirit of evil worked.

Mr. G. then made some appropriate remarks, taking for his text the apostolic injunction—"having done all, to stand." The North, he said, was proverbial for its yielding disposition. Political anti-slavery men were compromisers. They spoke against the encroachments of slavery, but they were sure to be vanquished. Mr. Sumner, in his eloquent speech last May, in New York, described, in glowing terms, the results that would follow the prostration of the slave oligarchy, and it was received with bursts of applause. But the question was, who would bell the cat? Here the political Abolitionists, like the mice in the fable, came to a dead pause. Political anti-slavery men, regarding the salvation of the Union as paramount, were bound to yield whenever the South threatened dissolution. Therefore the necessity for a bold stand on the part of Abolitionists.

Mr. G. then read, and commented upon, several extracts from the Southern press, showing the stand taken by them in relation to Northern action and agitation upon the question of slavery; and then, in contrast with this, he read an extract from an editorial in the *New York Daily Times*, begging the South to remain in the Union as the only means of preserving slavery. It was horrible to contemplate such a plea for the continuance of a partnership whereby four millions of human beings are kept in chains.

WM. S. PIERCE, Esq., called attention to some reported remarks of Mr. Garrison in which he was represented as saying that if such a case had occurred in Boston as occurred here in regard to Passmore Williamson, it would have created a civil war.

Mr. GARRISON denied that he had made any such remark; it was a mistake of the reporter. He had said that in the Burns case Boston was on the brink of a civil war, but he instituted no comparison between the two places.

Mr. PIERCE was glad that the gentleman had not made such a remark, and with this explanation he did not know that it would be courteous for him to make the remarks he intended. He, however, proceeded to make some statements of the doings of the people of Pennsylvania in reference to fugitive slaves, whereby it would appear that Pennsylvania was entitled to rather more credit than was generally bestowed upon her in this particular.

The Nominating Committee reported the following list of officers for the ensuing year, who were accordingly chosen:

President—JAMES MOTT.
Vice-Presidents—Benjamin C. Bacon, Robert Purvis.
Corresponding Secretary—J. Miller McKim.
Recording Secretary—Clinton Gillingham.
Treasurer—Sarah Pugh.
Executive Committee—Jacob Pierce, Mary Grew, Margaret J. Burleigh, Edward M. Davis, Abby Kimber, Lucretia Mott and Professor K. G. Thomas.

The receipts of the Finance Committee were, in pledges, $552; cash, $278; total, $830.

A resolution was adopted recommending the NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD to the support of the friends of the cause; after which the Convention adjourned, *sine die*.

The Richmond *Enquirer* exultingly heralds the re-election of Mr. Mason to the Senate, with the caption: "The Author of the Fugitive Slave Law fully endorsed by the Old Commonwealth."

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1855.

☞ A valuable collection of AUTOGRAPHS will be disposed of at the twenty-second National Anti-Slavery Bazaar Hall, 15 Winter street, Boston.

They are authenticated by ADAM BLACK, Esq., of the *Edinburgh Review*, by the Carpenter family of Bristol, and by others, their donors.

LETTERS OF

Dr. Prichard, the Ethnologist,	William Howitt,
Sydney Smith,	Sir Walter Scott,
Joseph Cottle,*	Mrs. Hemans,‡
Jane Porter, the novelist,	T. B. Macaulay,
Pye Smith,	Sir David Brewster,
Hannah More,	The Duke of Argyle,
Dr. Isaac Milner,†	Samuel Rogers,
Daniel O'Connell,	Miss Ferrier,
Thomas Clarkson,	Lord Jeffrey,
Harriet Martineau,	Cruikshank,
Joanna Baillie,	McCullock,
Sir Robert Peel,	Mrs. Chisholm,
Henry Vincent, the English Reformer,	Miss Nightingale,
Many Memorials of Oberlin,	Alfred Tennyson.

Autographs of Lord John Russell, Lord Brougham, and many other members of the Peerage.

Autographs of Ruskin, Dr. Pusey, Rowland Hill, Matthew D. Hill, Lady Byron, Sir John Bowring, Dr. Carpenter, Agnes Strickland, Mary Howitt, Marquis of Breadalbane, Professor Forbes, Catharine Sinclair, and many others of men eminent in science and literature.

* The "Bœotian Cottle," of Byron.

† The Tutor of Wilberforce, and author of Church History.

‡ Manuscript of "The Captive Knight," "A Voyager's Dream of Land," "A Monarch's Death-Bed."

NOW.

THERE are Representative Men, Mr. Emerson tells us. Representative Times there are, too, and we are in the midst of one of them—representative only as it is a striking illustration of what has always been. As the Representative Man does but exhibit in strong relief the characteristics which mark multitudes of other men, so this Time, portentous and fateful though it seem, is but the Representative of all the Times past of our National existence; only, the two Powers which have always been in arms against each other are more distinctly seen now than they were in former days, in their strength and in their weakness. We see on the one side Slavery, stern, resolute, defiant, knowing perfectly well what it wants, and stalking towards its design without variation or turning aside even for a moment. On the other hand is Freedom, wavering, vacillating, distracted by a thousand differing cares, easily diverted from the great end she should keep singly in view, and almost sure in the end to be hoodwinked and sent away stripped and ridiculous. Such is the difference between a vital and a sentimental purpose—one which touches the daily life and prosperity and one which only dwells in contemplation and in possibilities. Slavery stands for everything to the Slaveholder—for wealth, comfort, ease, the education of his children, the luxurious appliances of life, for foreign travel and sound position at home. It represents in his eyes all that the Northern merchant or manufacturer holds most dear and spends his life to obtain or to preserve.

The great mass, even of the intelligent and educated, of Northern men do not perceive the dependency of all those things they cherish on the principle of Freedom. As long as money is to be made under the existing state of affairs, they seek no change, but shrink from the chances of it, lest it should disturb the balance of their ledgers. Therefore it is that the mercantile and moneyed classes at the North are found in such close alliance with the Slaveholders. It is not necessarily that they love slavery for its own sake—though they certainly do not hate it for that reason—but they look upon the *status quo* as what secures to them the fruits of their enterprise and industry and gives them a chance for more. No one, scarcely, at the North regards Slavery as a real obstacle to his own success, and considers Freedom as an essential element of his worldly prosperity; while the Slaveholder feels Slavery to be as essential to his existence as the breath of life, and he knows instinctively that Freedom is the deadliest enemy of his life. Therefore the one goes on steadily, and without hesitation or remorse, to strengthen the position of Slavery and to secure its supremacy at all hazards, while the other, though discerning this purpose and in some degree understanding the importance of effectually resisting its accomplishment, shrinks from the sacrifices this work may call for, and in the delay he supplicates gives the enemy all the advantage he needs to secure his victory. The Propagandism of Slavery is to the well-to-do citizen of the North but as the distant rumour of a possible war; while the progress of Abolitionism is to the Slaveholder as the thundering of the enemy at the very gates of the citadel.

This accounts for what we see going on in the country at this time. This difference of character it is that has made the ambitious men of the North, almost without an exception, the ready tools of the Slaveholder, and has transformed the National Government into a mere engine for furthering the designs of Slavery. The Slaveholders have already taken possession of Kansas and secured the *de facto* government of the Territory. Time being all in all, they are already fomenting a civil war in that region, knowing that they will have the whole physical power of the Nation behind them. It was for such work as this that they made Franklin Pierce President. He and they perfectly understand each other, and plans of the conspirators have been laid with consummate skill. A *prima facie* case is all that is necessary to be made out, in order to give an excuse to the Commander in Chief of the Forces of Slavery at Washington to precipitate the whole weight of the Nation on the heads of the Free State rebels in Kansas. This has been done by the simple process of the Slaveholders or their agents taking possession of the polls, driving away all who differed from them, and electing a Legislature to suit their purposes. Any resistance to this Legislature, or its laws, is insurrection or treason, and the President stands ready, as soon as the case can be made out, as soon as the knot is worthy the interposition of the god, to step in and cut it with the sword of the Nation. The pursuit of a murderer is made the ground-work of such a demand, and we shall probably ere long hear of the advance of the main ally of the invading tyrant and the settlement of the whole question on the old terms of unconditional submission to his claims.

And while affairs are in this threatening posture on the frontier, how are the forces at the centre employing themselves? An accidental concurrence of circumstances has thrown the power of one House of the Legislature into the hands of the professed enemies of this Invasion of Kansas by Slavery. They have it in their power to present such a front of resistance, to threaten such disturbance to the very functions of government, as to check, if not to defeat, the imminent catastrophe. The power of Impeachment is in their hands; the stopping of the Supplies depends upon them; the blocking of the wheels of the Car of the National Juggernaut in a thousand ways, and the hindering its crushing out the hopes and the lives of their own friends, lies in their power. The hope of Freedom, of the Country, of the World rests with them. And what have they been doing during the precious hours of the past three weeks? Like the barbarous Germans Tacitus tells of, they have been madly gambling away these golden moments, and, not content with that, have risked their own liberties, and that of their children, on the turn of the political dice. In petty divisions as to the choice of a leader, they are risking all the valuable possibilities of the campaign. The enemy have taken the first step towards victory by dividing the hostile ranks. The South has the advantage of the first move, and the odds are great that she will soon succeed in checkmating her antagonist. Her forces are unbroken—the Household Troops—the Old Guard—as well as the Democratic camp-followers, are all united and ready to throw themselves into the scale which will make Slavery preponderant and supreme. It is as it has ever been. The new men have not made new times. It is but a chapter out of the old History. Alas that it should be so!

All this time is just so much gained for the Slavocracy. Their plots are ripening and will be ready for the plucking before they who are looked upon by the Northern people as their natural champions are ready to withstand their designs. Will there ever offer another so fair an opportunity for making head against the common enemy? And must precious time and strength be wasted on personal competitions, now and forever? Will the North never learn wisdom by experience and know that they are playing their adversaries' game by this way of carrying on the war? Not that we ever had any exalted hopes of the doings of this Congress. Not that we have expected work at its hands which Congresses are not yet trained to render—if they ever can be. But it is a melancholy symptom of the diseased state of the Northern head and heart, that no healthy effort is made for relief, under favourable circumstances which may never occur again. It is confirmation strong of the worldly wisdom and political sagacity of those who would not consent to assist in the election of any of these, even of the best of them, on the ground of the inherent viciousness of the commission under which they must act. That commission cannot but paralyze, if it do not taint, all who take service under it. Casting in their lot with thieves and adulterers, it is much if they preserve their own honesty and reputation clear—it is impossible that they should not feel the mischievous influence of companions whom they must sustain in their villanies as far as their common bargain goes. We are glad that the experiment has had so fair a trial. We shall watch its progress with the profoundest interest, ever ready to acknowledge, if the facts should justify it, that we augured falsely from the opening omens of the session.

Each succeeding stage in the history of the country confirms us in our faith in the practical wisdom, as well as the absolute moral integrity, of the ground taken by the American Anti-Slavery Society, and maintained by it, through much misrepresentation and many misunderstandings. We think it is becoming more and more demonstrably true that no effectual opposition to slavery can be made through the instrumentality of National politics; nor by the means of State politics either, excepting so far as the States are brought up to set the Constitution of the United States at defiance. This will be the first ground broken—and we think we have already seen the strokes of the spade. In the States, men who feel strongly the humiliations and dangers to which they are exposed by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, and who are not so scrupulous as they should be as to taking upon themselves obligations to support it which they do not mean to fulfil, these men will take measures to protect themselves at home by the force of State laws, framed in defiance to the Supreme Law of the Union. We do not justify the morality or assert the highest policy of such a course. We think an open repudiation of the Constitution, and a bold and Revolutionary movement for a new and a better one—by a single State, if no more could be found ready—would be a more effectual, as well as a more upright course of action. We only state what will happen, and indicate the natural and necessary channel in which our history is to flow. We cannot help being builders and co-workers in this task. The more faithful and untiring we are in the discharge of our own duty, the more nearly will those whom we stir up to action approach the true mark. It does not require a very exalted strain of virtue to do what is needed to be done. But the public mind has to be trained and educated up to that moderate development. It is this part of the work that we have undertaken, and we know that until this is performed no material political change can take place. We do not despair, then, even in view of such fantastic tricks as have been played before Heaven and in the face of man at Washington for the first weeks of the session. We thank God for what measure of encouragement we can draw from a division so nearly sectional as this. And we accept it as a proof of progress that so many men could stand out so long against the open and secret influences of Slavery backed by Power. Imperfect as this struggle has been, it is yet the strongest sign of life that Congress has ever shown.

MORE CLERICAL PRO-SLAVERY.....NO. II.

THERE is much difference of opinion respecting the relation of the clerical body, of all sects and denominations, to the great American question of slavery, and respecting the influence exerted by that body upon the existing fact and the probable increase of slavery. Many difficulties attend the solution of these questions, besides the fact that people must judge mainly by the specimens nearest them, and that these specimens show the man and the clergyman combined in widely varying proportions. It will be instructive, however, to examine and note the characteristics of a *perfect* clergyman, one in whom the man is not only overshadowed, stunted and absorbed by an *unconscious* preponderance of the clerical character, but in whom every humane natural aspiration is habitually crushed down and rooted out, in compliance with the demands of a theological system. Such an examination will help us to decide whether we will agree with Dr. Lord, in his statement (quoted in last week's STANDARD), that the problem of the future must be solved mainly by that class of men, and that they are the constituted leaders of society in morals and religion.

Dr. Lord—systematically and on principle—subordinates all things else to his theology; and, having chosen this course, he pursues it unflinchingly, judging all things, all men, all institutions by that test, and condemning without scruple whatever of venerable or excellent is at variance with it. We will, therefore, first look at those principles of his theology which he sets forth as the sure foundation and efficient defence of slavery.

The Jewish religion is radically and essentially different from the Christian. The history, principles and rules of the former are recorded in the writings called collectively the Old Testament, as the very different history, principles and rules of the latter are, in the writings collectively known as the New Testament. The Jews hold most tenaciously to the former of these books, and to the system therein delineated, and are still waiting for the Deliverer therein foretold, as the lineal descendant of David, who, sitting on his throne in Mount Zion, shall rule not only over his nation, still remaining the chosen and favourite people of Jehovah, but over the whole subjugated earth. On the other hand, the Christians, finding philanthropy and proselytism essential parts of the system portrayed in the record of *their* faith, the New Testament, and pitying the delusion and error of the Jews, are seeking to convert them *from* Judaism, and *to* Christianity.

Now, the first position taken by Dr. Lord, the foundation of his whole system, is to point us to these two publications (bound together under the name of the Bible) as a unitary document, the whole of which has the force of imperative law over us, and to which we are bound (with, or without, or against evidence) to pay implicit obedience. In relation to these not only varying but opposite authorities, he gives the same direction which Judge Peleg Sprague gave to those who asked what they should do when the laws of God required something diametrically opposite to the statutes of men—"obey both." Both, howsoever variant from each other, constitute our one imperative and infallible rule.

But lest men, as is likely enough to happen, should use this double-barrelled rule in another manner, and to other ends than he judges fit, Dr. Lord has given us, in aid of the proper interpretation of Scripture, a portrait of his God, combining, in quite unequal proportions, some lineaments of the Jehovah of the Old Testament, with some of the Heavenly Father of the New, and others of his own diabolical imagination. Thus:

He is, in a general way, perfect, and especially, his very essence is Love. But on going into detail, some imperfections, some limitations, and some decidedly unlovely traits are manifested, making the character fall far short even of *our* inadequate conception of perfection and of love. His object in the creation, preservation (so far) and government of mankind is not at all benevolence, but the manifestation of his own glory, or, as Dr. Lord elsewhere expresses it, "making himself illustrious." Not only is the happiness of his creatures not his *object*, he is and must be absolutely indifferent to it; and even in regard to their permanent welfare, their *eternal* welfare, he interests himself only enough to make a single brief experiment of salvation, which speedily falling, as far as the great majority of men, women and children are concerned, he turns to the infliction of eternal torments upon them, as an equally efficient and satisfactory way of "making himself illustrious." His infinite love of excellence *necessarily repels* sinners, and repels them because they do not help to render him illustrious by reflecting that excellence. If the only offer of reconciliation which they receive, made by a being who has begun by repelling them, who cares nothing for their happiness, and only to this extent for their welfare, and who will in any case use them only as material to burnish up his glory, prove not sufficiently attractive to induce their acceptance of it, his "love of excellence" yet *more* repels them, and will continue eternally to do so. And when, as the ultimate result of this system, the unfortunate majority shall be called to "suffer the vengeance of eternal fire," they may console themselves, if they can, with Dr. Lord's assurance that it is "always a fire of *love*," though objectively displayed in executing judgment and justice upon those whom His wisdom *could not* not convince, nor His holiness awe, nor His goodness soften."

With such ideas of God, and such ideas of love, and on the supposition that Dr. Lord has no more tenderness in his nature, and no more regard for his race than he attributes to the Deity, it is not strange that he should say (p. 67) "There is no *a priori* reason why God should *not* ordain a state of slavery, as well as other varieties of restraint and discipline. There are conceivable and probable reasons why he *should* ordain it, and there is, moreover, the evidence above detailed (quoted in last week's STANDARD) that he has actually ordained it. To question and oppose it, therefore, on any *merely philosophical* and speculative grounds, or politically, as malevolent, destructive of happiness, contrary to the rights of man, or inconsistent with our ideas of the natural progress and destiny of society, is to criticise by an infinitely unworthy standard, and incur the risks of that fatal plunge, which so many wise men and whole nations have taken, into atheistic unbelief."

This pamphlet makes frequent mention of atheism as the probable sequel of anti-slavery principles and actions. We had supposed it to be only the traditionary "old woman," to whom all sorts of follies and superstitions are attributed, who called a man an atheist because he did not believe in a devil; but Dr. Lord seems to hold the same idea.

We should naturally expect that the perfect clergyman, habitually striving, and with entire success, to be nothing else but a clergyman, and having the idea sketched above of the character of the invisible power whom he officially serves, would be mindful to give what aid and comfort he can to such prominent contemporaneous allies of the Slave Power as, being theological and clerical, are fit for him to notice. We find, accordingly, that Dr. Lord bestows emphatic approbation upon "the honourable example" of "such corrected observers as Dr. [South-Side] Adams," and upon that "dignified and excellent body," the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

If any one is surprised at our mentioning dishonesty in speech, tergiversation, misrepresentation, or even the direct saying of that which is not (for the glory of God), as a characteristic of the perfect clergyman, he must have mistaken or forgotten the *standard* of appeal and direction adopted by that class of men; which is *not* any ideas of the "natural" heart about right, justice or fitness—*not* any view (as one Paul long ago supposed) "which the mind takes of our relations and duties to God from a study of the works of nature"—*not* any "mere deductions and inferences of our unassisted minds" (as if God *ever* left us unassisted)—*not* any "teachings, either of induction and experience or of the mere instincts or the speculative faculties"—but, generally, *that which is written*, or, more particularly, any such fraction or fragment of what is written in the records either of the Jewish or the Christian religion, as will best suit the present necessity. So any thoughtless or irreverent person who should deny falsehood to be an appropriate means of promoting the glory of God would be immediately silenced by our perfect clergyman with the quotation of 2d Chron., xviii, 21.

We have space, at present, to notice only two of Dr. Lord's deliberate attempts to mislead his readers in matters of fact. One of these two is the following statement, p. 24:

"The whole natural condition of slaves, in every part of the world, in respect to food, clothing, shelter, health, safety, and the means of physical happiness in general, is far superior to that of any undisciplined negroes on the earth; and in respect to religious knowledge and moral culture, there is no comparison."

A statement like this, made in the same decade with the conspicuous histories of Box Brown, Frederick Douglass, William and Ellen Craft, and Mrs. Margaret Douglass, of Virginia—in the face of the twenty-five thousand fugitives who have run the gauntlet, first of southern rifles and bloodhounds, and next of northern kidnappers, in escaping from the sunny South to the wintry climate of Canada, who are certainly capable of appreciating the comparative physical comfort and, to some extent, the moral culture of the two situations, and who would be gladly welcomed back whenever they might choose to return—in the face of a profusion of testimony in relation to the sufferings of a very large proportion of our Southern slaves from *deficiency* "in respect to food, clothing, shelter, health, safety, the means of physical happiness in general, religious knowledge and moral culture," extending all the way from Theodore D. Weld's careful compilation of *Southern Testimony* to that effect, sixteen years ago, to Dr. C. G. Parsons's narrative, recently published, of his observation and experience during a prolonged residence and extensive journeys in the South, of which this examination was one especial object—needs only a single glance to show its impudent and enormous falsity.

The other instance to which we referred, and which, in the mouth of so skilful a master of language as Dr. Lord, *must* be considered a deliberate attempt to deceive, is his use of the expression (p. 30) "putting ignorant and imbecile men under *guardianship*," and various others of the same import, as synonyms of slaveholding; implying that the slave receives such protection, discipline and tutelage, *for his own benefit*, as the Northern ward or apprentice receives. Of course no Abolitionist would fall into this trap. But Presbyter addresses his letter to a class of men materially differing from Abolitionists, and many belonging to neither of these classes will read the letter without a doubt of the sincerity and good faith of one whom they suppose to be a minister *of the Gospel*.

Although we have had space to notice only a selection from the perversions of truth, reason and justice contained in this pamphlet, enough has been quoted and described to prepare us for a consideration of the question—considering the professional training under which the *perfect clergyman* is formed, the influence he wields when arrived at a state of maturity, and the position he holds in society, often, like Dr. Lord, chief of a seminary of learning, and thus having large opportunity to poison the fountains of instruction, at which thousands annually drink—and considering the tendency of ordinary clergymen and students of theology to look up to these men as models, and to move in the direction, if not to the full extent, of the path in which they lead—and considering the fact that, through all the months during which the atrocious statements of Drs. Lord and Adams have been conspicuously before the public, whatever disapprobation may exist among individual clergymen of their position as zealous propagandists of slavery, their credit with the profession for piety as Christians, and for soundness and thoroughness as Christian ministers, remains absolutely undiminished, and that not a single official protest against their course has appeared, either from a majority or from any proportion whatever of the ministers of the denomination with which they are connected "in good and regular standing," showing that, in the judgment of those ministers (who would promptly censure what they considered heresy or immorality), such sentiments derogate neither from the character nor the reputation of a Christian—and considering the dangerous concessions into which the mass of our population have already been entrapped, of looking upon the clerical order as the best representatives and the main supporters of true religion, and of accepting their standpoint, namely, a claim for the records of the Jewish religion (which they do not make for themselves) of being infallibly inspired by the one true God, so that their statements are unmixed truth, their laws binding upon Christians, their least sentence sufficient to nullify the clearest deductions of philosophy, science and philanthropy—and, finally, of so acquiescing in a system of interpretation which artfully exalts the letter over the spirit, that even the venerable names of Christ and Christianity are constantly and successfully used to oppose reform and sustain pernicious errors in theory and practice—whether we will admit the claim made by Dr. Lord and his order, that they are the constituted leaders of society in morals and religion, and that the problem of the future must be solved, mainly, by them? Shall we accept such leaders? Have we any assurance that in doing so we shall be really contributing either to the glory of God or the benefit of men? Have we not rather weighty reasons for rating them as kindred to those whom Christ denounced as blind leaders of the blind—straining out a gnat, but swallowing a camel—binding heavy burdens on other men's shoulders—building monuments to the old prophets, while (wanting the power to stone and crucify) they calumniate and execrate the new—passing by on the other side when an active word or deed is needed in behalf of suffering humanity—and using the repute of sanctity yielded by a credulous people to their long public prayers in the synagogues, to uphold and continue the oppression of those hungering, thirsting, naked, sick and imprisoned representatives of Christ, the slaves of the United States?

* This fairly parallels the felicitous expression formerly used by the Holy Inquisition, when, on handing over their victims to "the secular arm" to be burned alive, they entreated that all the gentleness and tenderness consistent with that purpose might be used, and particularly that no blood might be shed. This, too, was done in the name, and for the "glory" of God.

It is good for us to ponder these things, as men and women who need to know God's will, that we may do it. But meditation, to be useful, must lead to action. Let us act, each from the position we now stand in relative to the clerical order, in such manner as, to the extent of our power, to neutralize the influence of those most dangerous foes of Christianity who have thrust themselves into her household, and impudently claim the position of rulers over her children. C. K. W.

THE PENNSYLVANIA ANNIVERSARY.

WE have devoted so much of our space to Mr. Burr's faithful report of the proceedings of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society that we have room left for only a few lines of editorial comment.

The meeting was, as we expected it would be, exceedingly interesting and satisfactory, from its beginning, on Tuesday morning, to its final close on Thursday at one o'clock, P. M. The true-hearted Abolitionists of Chester, Bucks, Montgomery and other portions of Eastern Pennsylvania were strongly represented, while from New Jersey and Delaware came a few faithful and devoted friends of the cause, whose presence on such occasions is always cheering to their associates. The larger portion of the audience, however, was at all times composed of residents of Philadelphia, among whom, on several occasions, we noticed some eminent citizens who are rarely present at such gatherings, and whose attendance was probably, in part at least, the effect of the Kane outrage. It was the first time in many years that the Society had held its anniversary in Philadelphia, and the change in the public feeling since the day when such meetings in the city were the signal for mobocratic demonstrations was a subject of frequent remark and general congratulation. An evidence of this change was seen in the patient attention if not positive sympathy awarded to radical and revolutionary sentiments. Doctrines which, not many years ago, were indignantly repelled as the very acme of fanaticism, were now listened to with the seriousness which indicates a heartfelt conviction of their essential truth. The most radical utterances were those which elicited the heartiest applause. The general fairness, too, of the reports of the proceedings in the daily papers was another evidence of the striking change in public opinion which has been wrought within a very recent period. It was manifest, indeed, that the anti-slavery sentiment of Philadelphia had been much strengthened and intensified by recent events, and the general conviction that such was the fact exerted a happy influence upon the meeting.

The speaking on the occasion, if somewhat less exciting and impassioned than that which is sometimes heard in anti-slavery meetings, was excellent both in matter and manner, as our report will abundantly show. If in this respect there was anything to be regretted, it was that our Pennsylvania friends themselves took so small a share in the debates. It was natural, however, and by no means discreditable to them, that they should wish to afford the friends of the cause and others in attendance the fullest opportunity to listen to the impressive eloquence of Garrison, the irresistible logic of Burleigh and the Nathan-like rebukes of Foss. These champions of the cause—in themselves a host—gave earnest battle to the pro-slavery spirit of the times and proclaimed the gospel of anti-slavery with power from on high.

The harmony of the meeting was, perhaps, its most delightful feature. There were differences of opinion on minor points, but one spirit of devotion to the cause, and one purpose to struggle in its behalf, come what might to property, reputation or life. In this respect there was much to remind us of the early days in the history of the anti-slavery enterprise, when all the friends of the cause were of one heart and one mind, the pressure of mobocratic violence making them oblivious to sectarian and party distinctions.

The Annual Report of the Executive Committee, from the pen of J. MILLER MCKIM, the Secretary, of which a brief synopsis only will be found in our sketch of proceedings, was a highly satisfactory document, which we shall publish at length hereafter.

—Of the Anti-Slavery Fair, which followed the meeting, we can only say that, in spite of the extremely unpropitious state of the weather, it was highly successful in a pecuniary point of view, while, as a reunion of the friends of the cause in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware, and itself a conspicuous and demonstrative argument in favour of freedom, it was certainly all that could have been reasonably anticipated. A suggestion looking to the intermission of this instrumentality for one year, by way of experiment, was earnestly canvassed by those most deeply interested in the matter, but we believe there was at last a pretty general concurrence in the opinion, strongly expressed by some from the first, that such an experiment at the present time would be unwise, and that it would be far better to enter promptly and with renewed zeal into the preparations for another Fair, with a fixed determination to make it, if possible, more attractive, beautiful and profitable than any of its predecessors.

MRS. WEBB'S READING.

THE Drama of "THE CHRISTIAN SLAVE"—being a dramatic version of the story of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" by Mrs. STOWE herself—was read at the Tabernacle, on Tuesday evening, by Mrs. MARY E. WEBB, a coloured woman, whose talents as a public reader have won for her the approbation of large audiences in New England and elsewhere. It was her first appearance in this city, and therefore it is not strange that the audience was not as numerous as we had desired and hoped it would be. The body of the house, however, was well filled by a very intelligent and discriminating assembly, who evinced their appreciation of the performance by close attention and frequent applause. We do not speak too strongly when we say that Mrs. Webb's Reading was a delight to all who heard it, and that it left a highly favourable impression as to her dramatic powers. The following notices of the performance from two of the leading daily journals will show that our strong anti-slavery sympathies have not warped our judgment in this matter.

From The Tribune.

Mrs. WEBB—half African blood—read at the Tabernacle, last night, a drama called the Christian Slave, founded on Uncle Tom's Cabin. It was composed of the chief conversations in that work. Mrs. Webb has dramatic talent. She has a good musical ear, and intonates through the range of an extensive and sympathetic voice according to the characters evolved in the text, and has evidently taken much pains to qualify herself for her task. She is not unmindful of the effects of the toilet, and is good-looking beside. Her imitation of Topsey was particularly good. Her reading was repeatedly applauded, and was a success. It was announced that she would repeat the piece at the Athenæum, Brooklyn.

From The Times.

Mrs. MARY E. WEBB, "the coloured Siddons," read, last night, before an appreciative audience, at the Tabernacle, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe's Drama of the "Christian Slave." The reading was capital, the different tones of the different characters so well sustained throughout, that with the eyes closed one would have been sure that different readers were engaged upon the parts. We hope certainly that Mrs. Webb, who is a pretty and a bright mulatto, will repeat the entertainment. It was furnished last night under the auspices of the New York Anti-Slavery Society, Mr. Oliver Johnson in the Chair, assisted by two ladies.

It is probable, we understand, that Mrs. Webb will present the Drama in Brooklyn on Saturday (this) or Monday, evening.

SUDDEN BEREAVEMENT.—Died, in Cambridge, Mass., on Monday evening, Dec. 17, after an illness of only a few hours, WILLIAM GIBBONS, only son of James S. and Abby Hopper Gibbons, of this city, a member of the Sophomore Class in Harvard University, aged 22 years.

This bereavement, so unexpected and so sudden, has brought desolation to the household of which the deceased was the light, joy and hope. WILLIAM GIBBONS was a noble son and brother, and a general favourite in a wide circle of relatives and friends. His character, without a blemish, was worthy in all respects of his noble grandsire, the late ISAAC T. HOPPER. The bereaved parents, sisters and other relatives, in this "o'ersweeping hurricane of grief," will share the heartfelt sympathy of their numerous friends in different parts of the country.

The funeral will take place, we understand, on Sunday morning.

THEODORE PARKER will deliver the second Lecture of the Philadelphia series, on Tuesday evening, the 8th of January, at Concert Hall.

Three members of the Hutchinson Family have selected claims near Glencoe settlement, in Minnesota, where they intend hereafter to reside.

WILSON SHANNON.—Among the nominations lately submitted to the Senate by the President is that of Wilson Shannon, as Governor of Kansas. It is too much to hope from the Senate that it will reject such an incendiary.

The following resolution was adopted in the Texas Legislature on the 26th ult., by a vote of 73 to 3:

"*Be it Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Texas*, That the Legislature approves the course of Thomas J. Rusk, in voting for the Kansas-Nebraska act, and disapproves the course of Sam Houston in voting against it."

Gen. Cass has written the following letter to some Philadelphia gentlemen:

"DETROIT, Nov. 23, 1855.

"*Gentlemen:* I have received your letter asking me if I am a candidate for the office of President of the United States, and expressing the gratification it would give you to support me for that high station.

"While thanking you for this manifestation of your kindness and confidence, of which I shall always preserve a grateful recollection, I reply that I am not a candidate for the Presidency, nor do I desire that my name should be presented in connection with it to the consideration of the Democratic party of the Union.

"I am, gentlemen, with great regard, truly yours,

"LEWIS CASS."

MR. GARRISON AT MENDON.—We have just space enough left us to say that Mr. Garrison gave an excellent and effective Anti-Slavery lecture at Harrison Hall, on Friday evening, the 7th inst., and was listened to with much interest by an audience which was large for the place. He spoke chiefly of the religious and governmental aspects of the question, and illustrated and enforced, with great clearness and strength, the doctrine of "*No Union with Slaveholders.*' We heard of one person's saying at the close of the meeting: "Why, I thought that man was an infidel! But if that is infidelity, I want some more of it." And such is the judgment of unprejudiced *humanity* everywhere where Mr. Garrison's calm and inspired voice is heard. W. H. F.

—*Practical Christian.*

NEW DEFINITIONS FOR THE NORTH.—"Freedom,"—"Love of Freedom"—"Rights of Freedom"—"LIBERTY." *Definition:* An organization of the House to steal—to plunder—to rob the $70,000,000 in the Treasury."

"Northern Backbone." *Definition:*—Stiff hands in the Treasury, elbows deep—knuckles and all—the ability to stand up, with a brazen face, and steal—while crying for freedom."—*N. Y. Express.*

OLD DEFINITIONS FOR THE SOUTH.—"National Whig," "Friend of the Constitution," "Champion of the Union," "Advocate of the constitutional rights of the South." *Definition:* A doughface—one Brooks—a tool of Slavery—a traitor to Freedom—two Brookses.

"Patriotism." *Definition:* Complete subserviency to the Slave Power—the present editor of the *N. Y. Express*—betraying Republicanism for a price, or

Miscellaneous Department.

THACKERAY'S BALLAD.

THE BALLAD OF ELIZA DAVIS.

GALLIANT gents and lovely ladies,
List a tail vich late befel,
Vich I heard it, bein on duty,
At the Pleace Hoffice, Clerkenwell.

Praps you know the Fondling Chapel,
Vere the little children sing
(Lor! I likes to hear on Sundies
Them there pooty little things!);

In this street there lived a housemaid,
If you particularly ask me where—
Vy, it vas at four and twenty,
Guilford street, by Brunswick square.

Vich her name was Eliza Davis,
And she went to fetch the beer:
In the street she met a party
As was quite surprised to see her.

Vich he was a British sailor,
For to judge him by his look:
Tarry jacket, canvas trousies,
Ha-ha Mr. T. P. Cooke.

Presently this Mann accostes
Of this hinnocent young gal—
Pray, saysee, excuse my freedom,
You're so like my Sister Sal!

You're so like my Sister Sally,
Both in vaik and face and size,
Miss, that—dang my old lee scuppers!—
It brings tears into my heyes!

I'm a mate on board a wessel,
I'm a sailor bold and true;
Shiver up my poor old timbers,
Let me be a mate for you!

What's your name, my beauty, tell me?
And she faintly hanswers, "Lore,
Sir, my name's Eliza Davis,
And I live at twenty-four."

Hoftentimes came this British seaman,
This deluded gal to meet;
And at twenty-four was welcome,
Twenty-four in Guilford street.

And Eliza told her master
(Kinder they then Missuses are)
How in marriage he had ast her,
Like a gallant British Tar.

And he brought his landlady with him
(Vich was all his hartful plan),
And she told how Charley Thompson
Reely vas a good young man;

And how she herself had lived in
Many years of union sweet,
With a gent she met promiskous,
Valkin in the public street.

And Eliza listened to them,
And she thought that soon their bands
Vould be published at the Fondlin,
Hand the clergyman jine their hands.

And he ast about the lodgers
(Vich her master let some rooms),
Likevise vere they kep their things, and
Vere her master kep his spoons.

Haud this vicked Charley Thompson
Came on Sunday veek to see her,
And he sent Eliza Davis
Hout to fetch a pint of beer.

Hand while pore Eliza went to
Fetch the beer, dewoid of sin,
This etrocious Charley Thompson
Let his wile accomplish hin.

To the lodgers, their apartments,
This abandinged female goes,
Prigs their shirts and umberellas;
Prigs their boots, and hats, and clothes.

Vile the scoundrle Charley Thompson,
Lest his victim should escape,
Hocust her vith rum and vater,
Like a fiend in huming shape.

But a hi was fixt upon 'em
Vich these raskles little sore;
Namely, Mr. Hide, the landlord
Of the house at twenty-four.

He was valkin in his garden,
Just afore he vent to sup;
And on looking up he sor the
Lodger's vinders lighted hup.

Hup the stairs the landlord tumbled;
Something's going wrong, he said;
And he caught the vicked voman
Underneath the lodger's bed.

And he called a brother Pleaseman,
Vich vas passing on his beat,
Like a true and gallant feller,
Hup and down in Guilford street.

And that Pleaseman able-bodied
Took this voman to the cell;
To the cell vere she vas quodded,
In the close of Clerkenwell,

And though wicked Charley Thompson
Boulted like a miscreant base,
Presently another Pleaseman
Took him to the self-same place.

And this precious pair of raskles
Tuesday last came up for doom;
By the beak they was committed,
Vich his name was Mr. Combe.

Has for poor Eliza Davis,
Simple curl of twenty-four,
She, I ope, vill never listen
In the streets to sailors moar.

But if she must ave a sweet-art
(Vich most every gurl expex),
Let her take a jolly pleaseman;
Vich is name perups is—X.

MATHER BYLES.

From Duyckinck's Cyclopædia of American Literature.

THIS witty divine was born in Boston, 1706. He was the son of an Englishman, who died a year after his son's birth. On his mother's side he was descended from Richard, the founder of the Mather family, and John Cotton. Leaving Harvard in 1725, he was ordained in 1733, the first pastor of the Hollis Street Church. Here he remained until the outbreak of the American Revolution, when, in consequence of his adherance to the English government, this connection was broken off. In 1777 he was denounced in town meeting, and afterwards tried before a special court on the charges of having remained in town during the siege, prayed for the king, and received the visits of British officers. He was convicted, and sentenced to imprisonment, with his family, in a guard-ship, and to be sent to England. The first part of the sentence was changed to confinement in his own house, and the second was never put in execution. During this imprisonment he amused the good people of Boston by, on one occasion, very composedly marching to and fro before his own door, mounting guard over himself, having persuaded the sentinel to go on an errand for him on condition of supplying his place during his absence. The guard was soon removed, again restored, and not long after dismissed —changes which drew from the doctor the remark that "he had been guarded, reguarded and disregarded." Disregarded he remained, as he was henceforth suffered to live in retirement.

We have a last glimpse of Dr. Byles in the correspondence of Franklin:

MATHER BYLES TO B. FRANKLIN.

"BOSTON, 14th May, 1787.

"SIR: It is long since I had the pleasure of writing to you by Mr. Edward Church, to thank you for your friendly mention of me in a letter that I find was transmitted to the University of Aberdeen. I doubt whether you ever received it; but, under great weakness by old age and a palsy, I seize this opportunity of employing my daughter to repeat the thanks which I aimed to express in that letter. Your Excellency is now the man that I early expected to see you. I congratulate my country upon her having produced a Franklin, and can only add, I wish to meet you where complete felicity and we shall be forever united. I am, my dear and early friend, your most affectionate and humble servant, M. BYLES.

"P. S. I refer you to the bearer, Mr. Pierpont, to inform you how my life, and that of my daughters, have been saved by your *points*."

His death occurred some months after in 1788. He left two daughters, who remained unflinching loyalists, residing together in their father's house, on the corner of Nassau and Tremont streets, which no offer would induce them to part with, taking their tea off a table at which Franklin had partaken of the same beverage, blowing their fire with a bellows two hundred years old, going to church on Sundays in dresses of the last century, until 1835, when one of them, as the story goes, died of grief, as it is supposed, at having part of the old family mansion pulled down for the improvement of the street. The survivor lived two years longer. Both were unmarried, and must have attained a good old age, as we find Dr. Byles's daughters spoken of as a couple of fine young ladies by the Rev. Jacob Bailey, in 1778.

Dr. Byles's reputation as a wit has overshadowed his just claims to regard as a pulpit orator. His published sermons, of which several are extant, some of them having reached a second and third edition, show him to have possessed a fine imagination, great skill in amplification, and great command of language, combined with terseness of expression. Passages in these discourses would not do discredit to the best old English divines. Several were preached on public occasions, but are, like other discourses, entirely free from the political allusions in which his brother clergyman so frequently indulged. On being asked why he avoided this topic, he replied, "I have thrown up four breast-works, behind which I have entrenched myself, neither of which can be forced. In the first place, I do not understand politics; in the second place, you all do, every man and mother's son of you; in the third place, you have politics all the week, pray let one day in seven be devoted to religion; in the fourth place, I am engaged in a work of infinitely greater importance: give me any subject to preach on of more consequence than the truths I bring you, and I will preach on it the next Sabbath."

In the early part of his life, before and after his ordination, Dr. Byles wrote and published the following poems:

To his Excellency Governor Belcher, on the Death of his Lady, an Epistle. 1736, pp. 4.

On the Death of the Queen, a Poem. 1738, pp. 7.

An Elegy addressed to his Excellency Governor Belcher, on the Death of his Brother-in-law, the Hon. Daniel Oliver, Esq., pp. 6.

The Comet, 1744, pp. 4.

The Conflagration, the God of Tempest and Earthquake, pp. 8.

A portion of these were collected, with several others, in a small 18mo. volume of 118 pages, in 1736, with the following brief

"*Preface.* The Poems collected in these pages were, for the most part, written as the amusements of looser hours, while the author belonged to the college, and was unbending his mind from severer studies in the entertainment of the classics. Most of them have been several times printed here, at London and elsewhere, either separately or in miscellanies: and the author has now drawn them into a volume. Thus he gives up at once these lighter productions, and bids adieu to the airy Muse."

The poems are for the most part devotional or elegaic, including several hymns; Verses written in Milton's Paradise Lost; To the Memory of a Young Commander slain in a battle with the Indians, 1724; To an Ingenious Young Gentleman on his dedicating a poem to the author; To Pictorio on the sight of his pictures, and verses to Watts and others.

He also contributed a number of essays and occasional verses to the New England *Weekly Journal*. In 1744, *A Collection of Poems by Several Hands* appeared in Boston. It is a capital miscellany of verses, which seem to have been floating about in periodicals or manuscript at the period. Byles no doubt contributed some of its fifty-five pages, but none of its productions are pointed out in a copy now in the possession of Mr. George Ticknor, which bears on its title the inscription, "Th. Byles, Given her by her Father, Feb. 14, 1763," and contains several annotations in the handwriting of the original donor or owner. It is, however, easy to fix upon him the courtly answer to the following complimentary request, in which the blanks have been carefully filled up with the name of Byles.

TO ***** DESIRING TO BORROW POPE'S HOMER.

From a Lady.

The muse now waits from * * *'s hand to prese,
Homer's high page, in Pope's illustrious dress:
How the pleas'd goddess triumphs to pronounee,
The names of * * *, Pope, Homer, all at once!

The Answer.

Soon as your beaut'ous letter I peruse,
Swift as an echo flies the answ'ring muse;
Joyful and eager at your soft commands,
To bring my Pope submissive to your hands.

Go, dear, sweet Pope, transport th' attentive fair,
And soothe, with winning harmony, her ear.
'Twill add new graces to thy heav'nly song,
To be repeated by her gentle tongue;
Thy bright'ning page in unknown charms shall grow,
Fresh beauties bloom, and fire redoubled glow;
With sounds improv'd, thy artful numbers roll,
Soft as her love and tuneful as her soul;
Old Homer's shade shall smile if she commend,
And Pope be proud to write, as * * * * to lend.

It also contains a long and pleasantly written poem on Commencement Day, and a few burlesque ballads probably written by Byles or Joseph Green. One of these is as follows:

A FULL AND TRUE ACCOUNT OF HOW THE LAMENTABLE WICKED FRENCH AND ENGLISH PIRATES WERE TAKEN BY THE VALIANT ENGLISHMEN.

Good people all, pray understand
my dull-ful song of woe;
It tells a thing done lately, and
not very long ago.

How Frenchmen, Indians eke, a troop
(who had all drunk their cogues)
They went to take an English sloop:
O the sad pack of rogues!

The English made their party good,
each was a jolly lad,
The Indians run away for blood,
and strove to hide like mad.

Three of the fellows in a fright,
(that is to say in fears)
Leaping into the sea out-right,
sows'd over head and ears.

They on the waves in woful wise,
to swim did make a strife,
[So in a pond a kitten cries,
and dabbles for his life;

While boys about the border scud,
with brickbats and with stones;
Still downe him deeper in the mud;
and break his little bones.]

What came of them we cannot tell,
though many things are said:
But this, be sure, we know full well,
if they were drown'd they're dead.

Our men did neither cry nor squeek;
but fought like any sprites;
And this I to the honour speak
of them, the valiant wights!

O did I not the talent lack,
of 'thaniel Whittemore:
Up to the stars—i' th' almanack,
I'd cause their fame to roar.

Or could I sing like father French,
so clever and so high;
Their names should last like oaken bench,
to perpetuity.

How many pris'ners in they drew,
say, spirit of Tom Law!
Two Frenchmen, and papooses two,
three sannops, and a squaw.

The squaw, and the papooses, they
are to be left alive;
Two French, three Indian men must die:
which makes exactly five.

[Thus cipher, Sirs, you see I can,
and eke make poetry;
In commonwealth, sure such a man,
how useful must he be!]

The men were all condemned, and try'd,
and one nig-at almost say,
They'l or be hanged, or be reprieved,
or else they'l run away.

Fair maidens, now see-saw and wail,
and sing in doleful dumps;
And eke, ye bony babes all,
arise and stir your stumps.

This precious po'm shall sure be read,
in ev'ry towne, I tro:
In every chimney corner said,
to Portsmouth, Boston fro.

And little children when they cry,
this ditty shall beguile;
And tho' they pout, and sob, and sigh,
shall hear, and hush, and smile.

The pretty picture too likewise,
a-top looks well enough;
Tho' nothing to the purpose 'tis,
'twill serve to set it off.

The poet will be glad, no doubt,
when all his verse shall say,
Each boy, and girl, and lass, and lout,
for ever, and for aye.

The collection also contains a number of eulogies, which show that Byles was in high favour in Boston. His reputation was not, however, confined to his own town or country, as he corresponded with Lansdowne, Watts and Pope, who sent him his Odyssey.

The Doctor was an inveterate punster. The Rev. Jacob Bailey, the Missionary at Pownalborough, before the Revolution, says of him, after a visit to his house in 1778: "The perpetual reach after puns renders his conversation rather distasteful to persons of ordinary elegance and refinement." And Mr. Kettell quotes some contemporary verses to the same effect:

There's punning Byles provokes our smiles,
A man of stately parts,
He visits folks to crack his jokes,
Which never mend their hearts.

With strutting gait and wig so great,
He walks along the streets;
And throws out wit, or what's like it,
To every one he meets.

The latter part of his parody of Joseph Green's parody on his psalm shows that he was occasionally coarse in his jesting; but we have never heard any indelicacy or irreverence alleged against him.

The *ana* which have been preserved show that his reputation as a wit was well deserved. There was a slough opposite his house, in which, on a certain wet day, a chaise containing two of the town council stuck fast. Dr. Byles came to his door, and saluted the officials with the remark, "Gentlemen, I have often complained to you of this nuisance without any attention being paid to it, and I am very glad to see you *stirring in this matter* now."

In the year 1780 a very dark day occurred, which was long remembered as "the dark day." A lady neighbour sent her son to the Doctor to know if he could tell her the cause of the obscurity. "My dear," was the answer to the messenger, "give my compliments to your mother, and tell her that I am as much in the dark as she is."

One day a ship arrived at Boston with three hundred street lamps. The same day, the Doctor happened to receive a call from a lady whose conversational powers were not of the kind to render a long interview desirable. He availed himself of the newly arrived cargo to despatch his visitor. "Have you heard the news?" said he, with emphasis. "Oh, no! What news?" "Why, three hundred new lights have come over in the ship this morning from London, and the selectmen have wisely ordered them to be put in irons immediately." The visitor forthwith decamped in search of the particulars of this invasion of religious liberty.

When brought before his judges at the time of his trial they requested him to sit down and warm himself. "Gentlemen," was the reply, "when I came among you I expected persecution; but I could not think you would have offered me the fire so suddenly."

A *mot* of Byles's is related by the hospitable wits of Boston, to the visitor, as he passes by King's Chapel, in Tremont street. There are two courses of windows by which that building is lighted on its sides; the lower ones are nearly square. In allusion to this architectural peculiarity of the square embrasures of its solid walls, Byles said that he had often heard of ecclesiastical canons, but he never saw the port holes before. Another, a revolutionary witticism, does justice to Byles's toryism. When the British troops, the lobsters, passed his door, after entering the town: "Ah," said he, "now our grievances will be red-dressed."

His system of practical joking is said to have been as felicitous as his verbal, though rather more expensive to the victims.

The Doctor, however, occasionally met his match. A lady whom he had long courted unsuccessfully married a gentleman by the name of Quincy. "So, madam," said the unsuccessful suitor, on meeting her afterwards, "it appears you prefer a Quincy to Byles." "Yes, for if there had been anything worse than *biles*, God would have afflicted Job with them."

He was not, however, always unsuccessful with the fair sex, as he was twice married. His first wife was a niece of Governor Belcher, and her successor (the dignity apparently diminishing with the relationship) a daughter of Lieutenant-Governor Tailor.

In person Dr. Byles was tall and well-proportioned. His voice was powerful and melodious, and he was a graceful and impressive speaker.

MEMORIAL OF THE LATE MR. ESTLIN.

NO. VI.

IN all the efforts which Mr. Estlin and others like-minded (including in this number the active Society already alluded to, the *Bristol and Clifton Anti-Slavery Society*), were thus making to spread anti-slavery truth throughout the kingdom, and especially through the various churches and religious bodies without distinction, instead of receiving any coöperation and aid, or even a silent and inactive sympathy from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, its Committee and Secretary, they found themselves, on the contrary, perpetually misrepresented, and under continual necessity of stopping to correct erroneous impressions and remove injurious prejudices which had been instigated from that source. "A sure passport" (Mr. Estlin writes, May, 1851) "for a coloured man to the patronage of the London Society [meaning the B. and F. A. S. Society] is the profession of "decided piety, and *abuse of Mr. Garrison.*" The Secretary, Mr. Scoble, seemed to make it his chief business, at that time, to depreciate and undervalue the doings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, its friends and its publications (he had long withheld all recognition of them in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, and endeavoured to suppress all knowledge of them amongst British Abolitionists), and, on the other hand, to magnify and exalt into notice every other form and kind of American anti-slavery, no matter how feeble and inconsiderable, nor how little soever deserving of the name. To unmask and expose such hypocrisy, such positive falsehood and persevering malignity, became a prominent object, thenceforth, in Mr. Estlin's anti-slavery labours. On the other hand, he was greatly cheered, in all the fatigue and labour he had laid upon himself, at seeing many prominent journals and able men, as well as leading ministers of various sects, espouse the anti-slavery cause, and speak of it and its dangers, of its friends and its enemies, as truth and duty required. Among these, I cannot forbear to notice the Rev. Mr. Crisp, head of the Baptist College at Bristol, and Rev. Mr. Owen, who introduced the subject into the meeting of the London Congregational Union, at the same time exposing the real pro-slavery spirit and character of *Rev.* Mr. Chickering, of Portland, Maine, who was then present. Among the numerous *journals* which took high and manly ground on the question of slavery, I would particularly mention the London *Morning Advertiser*, whose Editor, Mr. Grant, becoming dissatisfied with the supineness of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, opened his columns to the discussion of the subject, and himself wrote many clear and able editorial articles. The uncompromising fidelity with which this gentleman exhibited the true character of the American pro-slavery ministers visiting England, and denounced the base work which they came to do amongst the British churches, especially entitles him to the thanks of all anti-slavery people. I must also name the Leeds *Mercury*, whose Editor, Mr. Edward Baines, once a member of Parliament in a letter which he addressed, at a later day, to the Editors of Journals in Boston, proved himself a true associate of England's anti-slavery worthies.

A member of the Bristol and Clifton Society writes, in the autumn of 1851:

"Nearly all the Quakers resident in ——— have been frightened away from aiding your cause by ——— and ——— [members of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society], so that only two or three have contributed, or even ventured to call and see the donations to the Boston Bazaar, when on exhibition at Mrs. ———'s. But there are true ones among them, who, we hope, will be found to love truth and freedom and humanity better than sect. * * * Our present help comes chiefly from the Congregationalists and Baptists, who seem to unite more practical benevolence and warmth of feeling to clear-sighted moral perception than most others. We scarcely ever find a member of the Church of England who understands why *we* should concern ourselves with such a distant evil as American slavery, one which in no way affects the interests of 'the Church,' and which, as a system, has Scriptural sanction! Among the Unitarians it is chiefly the poor and the working classes whose horror of the cruelties of slavery and compassion for its victims leads them to work (or *give*, to the utmost extent of their means) for any agency intended to abolish the evil. * * * It is worth living for to be in any way instrumental in adding to the number whose sympathy may cheer the toils of the American Abolitionists, and whose own lives must be enriched by an acquaintance with them."

I give this extract as an indication of the kind of co-operation which Mr. Estlin received from the Bristol and Clifton Society.

As showing his state of health, late in 1851, I make the following extract of a letter written in December of that year:

"The unusual interval between my letters to you, upon which you reasonably remark, is a matter quite beyond my control. I am in no want of subject—no want of inclination—my head is clear enough, and I could find sufficient time by occasionally sitting up a little or rising early—but I have no *physical ability* to conduct my correspondence with any regularity. Writing letters is particularly trying to me—those that I enjoy preparing, as much as such as are of more difficult composition; often one or two letters in the day are as much as I can undertake without an aching head and an irregular heart."

At this time, Rev. Edward Mathews, of Wisconsin, was in England, as an agent of the Free Mission Baptists of America. It was upon him that certain demons in human shape in Kentucky inflicted Lynch law, nearly drowning him, because, while engaged in his mission in that State, he had spoken of slavery as contrary to the merciful spirit and precept of the Saviour. He went to England, if I mistake not, partly to expose the unfounded claims of Josiah Henson, in professing to be an accredited agent to collect funds for the Dawn Institute, Canada West. In doing this work, Mr. Mathews incurred the enmity of Mr. John Scoble, who denounced him with bitterness. In the visit which Mr. Estlin made to London the June previous, he first became acquainted with Mr. Mathews and interested in his history, his sufferings, and his single-minded devotion to the anti-slavery cause. He subsequently became more intimately acquainted with Mr. M., aided him in some trying difficulties he had with the more bigoted Baptists, and with Mr. Scoble, assisted him in laying out, and carrying through, plans of anti-slavery lecturing, and writing for the press, and came to have an "entire confidence in his good sense, integrity and consistency." He further writes of Mr. M.:

"His great purpose is the non-fellowshipping with slaveholders by the different religious communities, and already he has gained the censure of many of the Baptist ministers. Some of these even who united in strong anti-slavery resolutions now shun Mathews, because he has attacked the *Evangelical Alliance*; this daring act has also estranged the Quakers from him; they deplore his doing anything to drive off the 'religious bodies' from the Anti-Slavery cause. * * Mr. Mathews sees (as I have told him) that his present course of offending Quakers, Baptists and other religious people, will be fatal to his collecting much money for the 'Free Mission Baptists'; but he will not allow this consideration even to modify his proceedings."

I insert one more sentence on this subject, as serving to show the entire victory, in Mr. Estlin's mind, which his Christianity had obtained over his theology: "I have put down my name," he writes, "as a subscriber to Mr. Mathews's fund, for three guineas, for I see that the spread of anti-slavery principles in his *first* and greatest object, far beyond the dissemination of orthodoxy. I don't care for the orthodoxy, if the anti-slavery be spread."

Governor Kossuth being, at this time, about to visit America, many English Abolitionists—among them Rev. Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Estlin of Bristol—took pains to bring to his attention the facts of slavery, as an institution in the United States, and some earnest and eloquent letters on the subject were addressed to him. How entirely in vain all these were, history has since recorded.

It was at about this time that the "Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society" formally dissolved their auxiliaryship to the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society*, and withdrew from all connection with it. The Special Report issued by the Bristol and Clifton Society, giving the grounds of their action, was a most ample justification of their course, and left the London "Anti-Slavery" Committee no retreat save in their sectarianism and self-conceit. The Report contained the whole history of the Society's connection with the British and Foreign Society, and of its separation therefrom, and is a truly valuable historical document.

From a letter of Mr. Estlin's, written in May, 1852, I extract the following:

"The box from Boston was duly forwarded from Dublin. We look at its *invaluable* contents with some of the interest you express on receiving our box of donations to the Bazaar. The *Annual Report*, the *Bazaar Gazette*, *Mr. Garrison's Writings*, and the American Anti-Slavery Society's *Letter to Kossuth*, are particularly valuable in my sight, as public documents; as are also the *American Almanac*, the Massachusetts *Sanitary Report*, and other pamphlets. Our best thanks to Mrs. —— for 'Uncle Tom's Cabin'; we have read it with great interest, and think it will be very instructive and useful here. The little said about Colonization does not appear to me as any great support of that scheme. A general sentiment exists here, and *I* partake of it, that, though Colonization was, and is, badly *intended*, an important colony *may be* founded in Liberia, productive of future benefit to Africa and even to America."

"I am glad it occurred to me to send you a *British Banner* [the organ of the Orthodox Dissenters], with Dr. Campbell's vile articles [alluding to a gross personal attack upon the American Abolitionists, and particularly upon Mr. Garrison, who was described as holding, not only in theory, but *in practice*, the loosest ideas of the marriage relation, and as seeking to remove all social moral restraints]. These attacks of the *Banner* are most injurious to your Society in this part of the world. There is no getting a counter statement before the thousands who read, and believe, the charges. Many persons now, since Dr. Campbell's articles, think it hardly delicate to allude to Mr. Garrison! This only renders the duty of replying more imperative. With you, the charges may be too gross to do any harm; it is otherwise among our unenlightened [on anti-slavery topics] public; a large number of whom only know of Mr. Garrison as a violent, immoral, infidel leader of a fanatical Abolition party. * * * We have invited Miss Sarah Pugh [of Philadelphia] to visit us, and she has promised to come. 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' in the English edition, is already flying about."

In June, 1852, he writes from London:

"I have been very busy since I left home, and am in lodgings where W. Wells Brown stays. Mr. E. Mathews has been my guest, and he, and Brown, and I, have all our meals together. * * * At some breakfast parties, I have had George Thompson and others, with the above named, and we have proposed and discussed various anti-slavery plans, and an organ, to be called the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*. The latter is our main purpose —to be a monthly sheet of sixteen pages, full of useful information, especially of that kind which the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* has suppressed. We mean to make no flourish, to have no prospectus or proposals, but to let our sheet, to be issued in London the first of August, be our herald. * * * I am hopeful about the paper, for there is a want of such a publication through the country. I have been talking to-day with Mr. Ashurst on the matter, who approves the scheme, and promises help. W. W. Brown is calling Scoble to account for malicious reports about him."

A month after this (July 16th), I had a letter from Mr. Estlin, dated, to my surprise, at *Dublin*. What could have taken him thither, at his time of life and in his feeble health? The following portion of his letter answers the question:

"My daughter and I have been here since the 6th inst. It is the first time I have visited Ireland; dislike to the sea, among other reasons, and having no special attraction there, have kept me away from the 'sister isle' till now: and it is anti-slavery objects and sympathies which have drawn me hither. Mr. Webb has been very pressing for us to visit him during Miss Pugh's stay in Dublin, . . . and I was anxious to communicate with him about our projected paper, the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, which we meant to have had out on the first of August, but it will necessarily be delayed for a month or two. I have no fears for the experiment, and hope we shall begin in September or October."

This is the simplest possible statement of his reasons for undertaking a journey to which, under other circumstances, he would scarcely have thought himself equal. It is a touching proof of devotion to the good cause he had learned to love so well, and of readiness to undertake any labour in its behalf which his judgment commended as wise and likely to be useful. I fear that it is beyond a doubt that, throughout this entire year (June, 1852, to May, 1853), he tasked himself too heavily, and laid upon his slight and delicate frame duties too numerous and too great for his bodily strength. But his whole soul was warm with devotion to the sacred cause of Humanity, and his heart rejoiced in its life-giving power.

During this visit to Dublin, all the arrangements were matured, or put in train, needful to the commencement of the *Advocate*. One of the earliest and most intelligent friends of the anti-slavery cause was engaged to act as its editor, a gentleman well known by his words and works in behalf of freedom, whose steadfast and clear-sighted advocacy of the great principles upon which the anti-slavery movement rests had long endeared him to all American hearts who love the cause, and whose writings have been as instructive here as (we have reason to know) they have been abroad. That there might be no doubt about the business credit of the paper, Mr. Estlin himself guarantied all expenses, the generosity of a few persons in London, Bristol, &c., seconding his own. The first number of the *Anti-Slavery Advocate* appeared in October, 1852. It has been regularly published to the present time. Never, as yet, sustained by its subscription list—although never was a paper published which, from its high moral tone, eminent ability and valuable services to freedom, better deserved to be—it has appeared with the utmost regularity, occasionally being issued on a double sheet, printed with exceeding neatness and good taste, and altogether such a paper as its regular readers cannot fail to trust and become attached to. Its appearance was a "declaration of independence," on the part of some of the most active and most earnest of British Abolitionists, of the authority and control of the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society*—the inauguration of a new era in the anti-slavery history of England, in which this great cause was itself set free from much which had trammelled and enfeebled it, and shorn it of its strength.

Within a few months from the first appearance of the *Advocate*, a marked change took place in the affairs of the Society just named. Mr. Scoble relinquished the office of Secretary, and editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, terminated his connection with the Society, and went to Canada. A new Secretary was chosen, the *Reporter* was remodelled, and became at once more varied and interesting in its contents, and more just, liberal and kindly in tone and manner towards the *American Anti-Slavery Society* and its friends, both in America and Europe. Of course, we cannot aver that the high character and probable influence of the *Advocate*, and the evident success of its friends in their efforts to new-create the anti-slavery sentiment of England, were the means of making Mr. Scoble's resignation necessary or advisable. But it is very certain that, with his departure, a wholly new policy appeared to be adopted by the Society; and that those anti-slavery persons, both English and American, came to be treated with deference and courtesy, who before were attacked, openly or secretly, as disguised enemies of the cause, and real propagators of infidelity and immorality.

For the establishment of the *Advocate*, the anti-slavery cause owes a large debt to Mr. Estlin. Had he done no more for it but this, and given no other proof of friendship for it, this alone would have entitled him to a high place on its list of friends.

S. M., JR.

POLITICAL PREACHING.

ALL, I suppose, agree that political preaching—that which takes sides with a political party as such, and advocates its measures and course on political grounds and considerations—is to be deprecated and condemned. All agree that the preacher has a separate and peculiar, a higher and holier work; namely, the enunciation and enforcement of eternal principles, with a showing forth of their practical relations to individuals and communities. But if, in doing this, it so happen that his views are coincident with those of a party, is he justly chargeable with preaching "politics," in any opprobrious and unworthy sense? Would to God the principles and policy of political parties were so in unison with the absolute right that, in preaching the latter, one might seem to be pleading for the former! No: a false issue is presented, ignorantly or knowingly, with regard to this matter. The issue is *not* whether political preaching is bad and wrong; whether party spirit in the pulpit, in relation to this as to every other subject, is bad and wrong. There is no controversy here. But *this* is the issue: whether the preaching of the pulpit is to have nothing to do with a great moral and religious subject, because it has come to have political bearings and associations. In other words, is the preacher to ignore this evil of which we speak—this crime against humanity and God; to go on, from month to month and year to year, as though it were not; to stand in his place and see its portentous cloud spreading and darkening on his country's sky, with the rumble of distant thunder in its deepening folds; to see increasing millions—those whom God loves, those for whom Christ died—robbed by it of their birthright, neglected, despised, degraded; to see its corrupting influence upon those afar who cherish, and those around who extenuate and defend it—the gradual but sure debauchment of the public conscience—the suppression, in its favour, even in youthful breasts, of the holy instincts of freedom and the dear sympathies of humanity; to see the kingdom of heaven hindered in its advancement, more than by aught else, by its presence and power—is he to see all this—to see it with God's open Word before him, and his secret voice within—and keep all unspoken their united condemnation? *This*, friends, is the question—stripped of its sophisms, seen in its nakedness—which circumstances have thrust between us; this, and this only. Say, merely, that the preacher should not be *continually* presenting the topic in question—should not give it *prominence* among his selected topics; it is assented to. Say, further, that he should never present it with a view to *political and party ends*—never with the spirit and tone of a partisan; it is assented to. But say that he should never present it at all; that it should be for him an interdicted topic: it is denied. The assertion is most preposterous. It is to be instantly and earnestly repelled. I marvel at the presumption that proposes the exclusion of this subject from the pulpit and the church, and its surrender to the politician and to party. Yet more do I marvel that the pulpit and the church, with any living sense of their responsibilities, should ever have consented to such surrender; in ispstances not a few, they have, and, in so doing, been manifestly recreant to their trust. If it may be so with *this* evil and wrong, then why not with any and every other? feeding, though they may be, on the very vitals of the community, and carrying wretchedness and degradation to uncounted homes. *They*, too, because legislation may have taken them up, and parties been formed in relation to them, may be barred out from the circle of permitted topics, and religion be left to look out upon them from her sacred places, and be dumb before them—aye, give them the *approval* which silence, by implication, is. The very obvious fallacy which runs through much that is said and written about politics in the pulpit, in the connection spoken of, is the assumption that the subject of slavery is primarily and exclusively a political one, and that its discussion in the pulpit must necessarily be on party grounds and in a party spirit. Both of these assumptions being false, the conclusions drawn from them are therefore forceless. And, apart from all other considerations, one is disposed to but little respect for this outcry of "political preaching," at every assertion of the unrighteousness of our country's cherished institution, when he sees how many of those most forward to raise it are quite forgetful to do so in the hearing of preaching equally obnoxious to the appellation, as regards the subject-matter of it, besides being inhuman and atheistic—the preaching, namely, that apologizes for this institituted oppression, and elevates its enactments above the statutes of the Almighty.—*Discourse by Rev. N. Hall.*

EVELYN HOPE.

BY ROBERT BROWNING.

BEAUTIFUL Evelyn Hope is dead!
Sit and watch by her side an hour.
That is her book-shelf, this her bed;
She plucked that piece of geranium flower,
Beginning to die, too, in the glass.
Little has yet been changed, I think—
The shutters are shut, no light may pass
Save two long rays thro' the hinges' chink.

Sixteen years old when she died!
Perhaps she had scarcely heard my name—
It was not her time to love; beside,
Her life had many a hope and aim,
Duties enough and little cares,
And now was quiet, now astir,
Till God's hand beckoned unawares,
And the sweet white brow is all of her.

Is it too late, then, Evelyn Hope?
What! your soul was pure and true,
The good stars met in your horoscope,
Made you of spirit, fire, and dew—
And just because I was thrice as old,
And our paths in the world diverged so wide,
Each was nought to each, must I be told?
We were fellow-mortals, nought beside?

No, indeed! for God above
Is great to grant, as mighty to make,
And creates the love to reward the love.
I claim you still, for my own love's sake!
Delayed, it may be, for more lives yet,
Through worlds I shall traverse, not a few—
Much is to learn and much to forget
Ere the time be come for taking you.

But the time will come—at last it will—
When, Evelyn Hope, what meant, I shall say,
In the lower earth, in the years long still,
That body and soul so pure and gay?
Why your hair was amber, I shall divine,
And your mouth of your own geranium's red—
And what you would do with me, in fine,
In the new life come in the old one's stead.

I have lived, I shall say, so much since then,
Given up myself so many times,
Gained me the gains of various men,
Ransacked the age, spoiled the climes;
Yet one thing, one, in my soul's full scope,
Either I missed, or itself missed me—
And I want and find you, Evelyn Hope!
What is the issue? let us see!

I loved you, Evelyn, all the while;
My heart seemed full as it could hold—
There was place and to spare for the frank young smile
And the red young mouth and the hair's young gold.
So, hush—I will give you this leaf to keep—
See, I shut it inside the sweet cold hand.
There, that is our secret! go to sleep;
You will wake, and remember, and understand.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Sidney Smith, on seeing a lump of American ice, remarked that he was glad to see anything solvent come from America.

—BRAN NEW.—The expression "bran new," from a contraction, has become a corruption of the Scotch phrase, "braw and new."

—The *Cork Constitution* mentions that Mrs. Gore's novel, "The Banker's Wife," of which the villany of an unprincipled banker forms the groundwork, was dedicated to Sir John Paul, as an illustrious example of probity and good faith, and one in whom the office of banker was made honourable.

—PLANTING.—The late Sir Watkin Williams Wynn planted, from 1815 to 1820, upon mountainous lands in the vicinity of Llangollen, situated from 1,200 to 1,400 feet above the level of the sea, 80,000 oaks, 63,000 Spanish chestnuts, 102,000 spruce firs, 110,000 Scotch firs, 90,000 larches, 30,000 wych elms, 35,000 mountain elms, 80,000 ash, and 40,000 sycamores.

—A LONDON FOG.—Few persons can form any idea of the density of a London fog from what they occasionally see in this country. On the 15th and 16th November a dense fog prevailed in London and its vicinity, during which steamboats and omnibusses ceased to run, hacks and cabs got on the side-walks, numbers of persons walked over the wharves into the Thames, and were drowned; similar accidents took place in the locks and basins of the several docks, with many fatal results; persons were stopped and robbed in the streets with impunity, and several shops were plundered in day time, without a possibility of efficient interference by the police, so dense was the misty pall that overspread the monster city.

—DID EDMUND BURKE WRITE SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS'S "LECTURES"?—On looking into a memoir of Edmund Burke, in Walker's Hibernian Magazine for 1810, I was startled by the following statement, and am desirous of knowing whether it has any foundation to rest upon: "In 1760 the Royal Academy was opened; Sir Joshua Reynolds was appointed president, and Mr. Burke wrote that address which made the name of the amiable president so justly celebrated. Every one of those addresses, which have so much delighted the artists of Europe, was written by Mr. Burke from hints furnished him by Sir Joshua. For this service Mr. Burke was known to receive £4,000, and it is probable he received much more. Sir Joshua's sight grew dim; and the necessity of a fair copy being made out for him, not being able to read Mr. Burke's crowded page, led to this discovery."—*Notes and Queries.*

—In a letter of the late Thomas Campbell just printed, the deceased poet expresses himself as distressed at his inability to discover materials for a life of Mrs. Siddons. "Dear good Mrs. Siddons," he writes, "she was a very angel, but devils make better stuff for biography than angels. The old toothless ladies —once dashing beauties —that were her sworn friends, heap upon me reams of proofs of her piety and purity; but Lord help me, I can make no use of all their twaddle. * * Had she been a fie-fie, or a drunkard, or a termagant, I should have had comparatively a sinecure in my biographical duty to her. Nevertheless, there are some interesting particulars about her: her great great grand-uncle was executed for being a Catholic priest. I have some faint hopes of being able to prove that he was even burnt alive; but unhappily that is not certain. Poor man, it would make no difference to him now by what death he died, but to me it would be most desirable, if possible, that he should have died by fire, for the sake of an exciting impression on my amiable readers."

—MECCA.—Lieutenant Burton, who has just written an account of a visit to Mecca, is not the first European who has reached these forbidden centres and shrines of El Islam. Some few had preceded him, and made hurried observations. In the year 1503 Ludovico Bartema, "gentelman of Rome," went there "in familiaritie and friendshyppe with a certayne Captayne Mameluke," and in the garb of a "Mama